

# **COMNAVRESFOR 1999 RESERVE POLICY BOARD ANNUAL REPORT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**COVER LETTER**

**CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION**

**MEMBERSHIP**

**CATEGORY I ISSUES**

**CATEGORY II ISSUES**

**CATEGORY III ISSUES**

**MID-YEAR REVIEW ISSUES**



**COMMANDER  
NAVAL RESERVE FORCE  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70146-5046**



**POLICY BOARD  
ANNUAL REPORT  
1999**



# DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

COMMANDER NAVAL RESERVE FORCE  
4400 DAUPHINE STREET  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70146-5046

IN REPLY REFER TO

5420

Ser N52/

00009

6 JAN 2000

From: Commander, Naval Reserve Force

Subj: 1999 COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POLICY BOARD

1. The 1999 Commander, Naval Reserve Force Policy Board convened during February 1999. This board considered a total of 111 policy items submitted through the chain of command by various Naval Reserve activities. This Annual Report of the Board's deliberations and recommendations is separated into the following four categories:

a. Category I - Items recommended for consideration by higher authority.

b. Category II - Items forwarded to various commands, including COMNAVRESFOR, for administrative resolution.

c. Category III - Items requiring no further action.

d. Mid-Year Review - A review of outstanding items six months following Board adjournment.

2. Copies of this Annual Report are printed for distribution to Naval Reserve activities. A copy should be made available to all units supported by your command so individuals who originated items may be advised of their disposition.

3. Those members who submitted policy items, members of the various local boards, and all personnel who provided administrative support are commended for their considerable efforts.

J. B. TOTUSHEK

Rear Admiral, U.S. Naval Reserve

Distribution: (COMNAVRESFORINST 5218.2B)

List A (A1, A2A, A3 (N095) only, A5)

B

C

D

## **1999 BOARD CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION**

The 1999 Commander, Naval Reserve Force Policy Board ("Board") convened in New Orleans, Louisiana from 21-26 February. Members of the Board were representatives of a broad spectrum of the Force. Together, the Board carefully considered each issue referred to the Board from all elements of the Naval Reserve. The Board's appreciation for the initiative of those members of the Force who took the time and effort to submit issues cannot be overstated. Progress and the management of change requires a robust dialogue from every corner of the Naval Reserve. Thank you all.

The Board was supported and briefed by many members of the Air, Surface and Commander, Naval Reserve Force Staffs. This significantly assisted the Board in their understanding of the issues and reduced the time necessary to reach conclusions and to formulate recommendations. Many thanks to those dedicated Full Time Support personnel for their help.

Among the issues reviewed by the Board were items dealing with pay and allowances, retirement, training, contributory support to the active component, the APG/AIA Program and many other suggestions on how to improve the way the Naval Reserve conducts business and supports the Navy. One hundred eleven issues were received for the 1999 Board, however, you will see while reading through this Annual Report that some were combined because of the like content. Of the submissions, 50 were resolved based on existing guidance, 17 were retained for further discussion and 8 were forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy's National Naval Reserve Policy Board for inclusion in their deliberations.

Six months after the Board adjourned, we held a Mid-Year Review of the 28 open issues. Our goal was to close as many as possible, but because of several circumstances, we could only close four. It was determined that one particular issue needed the attention of higher authority, and it was subsequently changed to a Category I item and forwarded to the National Board. For the first time, the results of this Review are contained in this Annual Report so you can read the most current status of each open issue. You will find it at the last tab.

The Naval Reserve Force Executive Steering Committee (ESC) continues to carry out a program of ongoing examination and implementation of improvements to all of our Force processes. Over time, this institutional approach to process improvement should assist in reducing the volume of issues submitted to the Board. The work of the ESC in resolving ongoing concerns was again evident and significantly narrowed the scope of the Board's review of a number of items. Given this successful track record, the Board anticipates that the ESC should be able to remain as a catalyst for managing the change which is an integral part of the future of our Naval Reserve.

Information Technology (IT) issues continue to dominate the topics submitted from all parts of the Naval Reserve Force. With the advent of NSIPS, the RSTARS system will soon be transformed. The planned implementation of a Navy intranet, coupled with the execution of Naval Reserve Infrastructure Plan 2000, and the related development of World Wide Web interfaces with Naval Reserve Activities, will change the face of how the Reservist is supported.

Despite all of these developments, our Naval Reserve will continue to rely most heavily upon the leadership and management capabilities of our Commanding Officers, our Officers and Chief Petty Officers, as well as everyone in the chain of command who has an impact on assuring that we accomplish our mission on a daily basis.

More work remains to be done. New issues will emerge as we move into our new century. The tireless efforts of many dedicated Reservists are reflected in this final product of the 1999 Commander, Naval Reserve Force Policy Board. We appreciate all of the contributions of everyone who made our work possible and assisted in making the Board process easier than ever before.

*J. N. H. COSTAS*  
*Rear Admiral, U.S. Naval Reserve*

## 1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD

**RADM John N. H. Costas**  
USNR/1315  
Chairman  
Fort Worth, Texas

**YNCM(SW) William K. Anderson, Jr.**  
USNR(TAR)  
Member  
Slidell, Louisiana

**RADM Joseph C. Hare**  
USNR/1115  
Deputy Chairman  
Villanova, Pennsylvania

**HMCM(SW/AW/FMF) Kurt E. Lewis**  
USNR(TAR)  
Member  
Slidell, Louisiana

**CAPT Jesse D. Cannon**  
USNR/ 5105  
Committee Chairman  
New Orleans, Louisiana

**DKCM Clyde H. Saunders, Jr.**  
USNR-R  
Member  
Alexandria, Virginia

**CAPT Wayne K. Kruger**  
USNR/ 1115  
Committee Chairman  
Portage, Michigan

**AWCS(AW/NAC) Glenn F. Welling, Jr.**  
USNR-R  
Member  
Batavia, Ohio

**CAPT Claude E. Timmerman**  
USNR/ 1315  
Committee Chairman  
Poway, California

**ATC(AW) John G. Bercey**  
USNR-R  
Member  
Redondo Beach, California

**CAPT Roberta M. McCoy**  
USNR/ 2905  
Member  
Acworth, Georgia

**YNC(AW) Walter R. Rouxel**  
USNR(TAR)  
Force Policy Assessments/Coordinator  
Slidell, Louisiana

**CDR Linda T. Gaines**  
USNR/1705  
Member  
Auburn, Washington

**YNC Martha C. Cummins**  
USNR-R  
Recorder/Administrative Supervisor  
Lynnwood, Washington

**CDR Adolf A. Ramirez**  
USNR/1117  
Member  
Clearwater, Florida

**PNC(AW) Sharon D. Brosmer**  
USNR(TAR)  
Administrative Support  
Slidell, Louisiana

**CDR Selvin L. (Layne) Smith**  
USNR/1317  
Member  
Douglasville, Georgia

**YNC Rhonda M. Smith**  
USNR-R  
Administrative Support  
Oak Harbor, Washington

**LCDR JoAnn Green**  
USNR/1707  
Member  
Slidell, Louisiana



**BACK ROW (left to right)**

PNC(AW) Brosmer, LCDR Green, YNC(AW) Rouxel, YNCM(SW) Anderson,  
ATC(AW) Bercey, YNC Cummins, HMCM(SW/AW/FMF) Lewis,  
DKCM Saunders, CDR Ramirez, CDR Gaines, AWCS(AW/NAC) Welling,  
CDR Smith, YNC Smith

**FRONT ROW (left to right)**

CAPT McCoy, CAPT Kruger, RADM Hare, RADM Costas, CAPT Timmerman,  
CAPT Cannon





**CATEGORY I**  
**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD**

<u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>ORIGINATOR NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
I-1	SD-03/1530-99	ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPENDENTS OF RETIRED AND DRILLING SELRES FOR A PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION AT A SERVICE ACADEMY
I-2	06-13/4200-99	CONTRACT BERTHING (CB) FOR SELRES
I-3	WA-04/5312-99	JOINT WARFARE DESIGNATOR FOR TAR AND SELRES OFFICERS
I-4	06-07/7000-99	ADVANCE DRILL PAY RECOUPMENT UPON SUBSEQUENT RECALL TO ACTIVE DUTY
I-5	DC-03/7000-99	RETIREMENT PAY (50% VS. 40%)
I-6	FL-07/7000-99	SPACE AA≅ TRAVEL FOR RETIRED ("GRAY AREA") SELRES
I-7	SD-04/7000-99	PRE-TAX ACCOUNT FOR DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSE INCURRED DURING DRILL PERIODS OR ACTIVE DUTY
I-8	SD-07/7000-99	VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCE (VHA) FOR SELRES

**ITEM:** I-1-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-03/1530-99

**SUBJECT:** ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPENDENTS OF RETIRED AND DRILLING  
SELRES FOR A PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION AT A SERVICE  
ACADEMY

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Paul M. Shaw  
NR NAVAIRPAC 1094  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 423-6456

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Active duty, retired personnel and Medal of Honor recipients are allowed to have their dependents compete for a Presidential nomination to a Service Academy. A nomination to a Service Academy does not ensure acceptance, as all nominees still are required to compete for an appointment. The nomination is a critical step to be eligible for entry to a Service Academy.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Drilling and retired Reservists, in recognition of their honorable service as a member of the Armed Forces, should be eligible to have their dependents compete for a Presidential nomination to a Service Academy. There is not additional cost to the military for this concession. The Service Academies are still going to pick the most qualified applicants from the pool of nominees.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Paul M. Shaw

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Current statutory law (10 U.S.C., Section 12731) wording for this category is as follows:

*A children of career military personnel (enlisted, warrant and commissioned) may be appointed by the President of the United States. Up to 100 Cadets or Midshipmen may be appointed to each of the Academies, except for the Coast Guard Academy, under this competitive category. Candidates from this category who have a parent on active duty for at least eight continuous years,= retired with retirement pay or deceased, from any of the uniformed services are selected from the best qualified applicants.=*

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-03/1530-99 (CONTINUED)

Recommend changing the wording to include *Aon active duty and/or Reserve duty with 10 years of combined service...* to allow children of Reservists to apply for Presidential nominations.

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend changing existing law by adding children of Reservists are eligible to apply for Presidential nominations.

**CO, NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the recommendation of the Board. This is another artificial division between the active and Reserve components which should be eliminated.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Presidential and Congressional appointments to the three service academies are an important credential for prospective candidates seeking admission. It is the consensus of the Board that to provide for Reserve Component members to be eligible for Presidential and Congressional nominations for our SELRES dependents would be in keeping with the Total Force policy.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**ITEM:** I-2-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-13/4200-99

**SUBJECT:** CONTRACT BERTHING (CB) FOR SELRES

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Michael Schesser  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Six

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Readiness commands have been directed to be creative in identifying methods to restrict demand for contract berthing (CB) dollars. Although funded from discretionary funds from COMNAVRESFOR, many perceive CB to be an Aentitlement.≡ As a result, Acreative≡ solutions in any single REDCOM which have the result of imposing restrictions on availability may create the perception of inequity and adversely impact morale and ultimately retention.

**RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR implement uniform policy guidance after appropriate investigation.

**ACTION OFFICERS:**

CAPT Karen T. Danis  
GEN IMA  
NAVMARCORESCEN Washington  
(703) 601-0241

CDR Philip J. Markert Jr.  
VTU 0611  
NAVRESCEN Richmond  
(540) 885-0888

LCDR Michael H. Maertzig  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Six  
(703) 613-0904

DKCM Clyde Saunders  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Six  
(703) 607-5038

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIX POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur with the perception of CB as entitlement. Each year, there is a scramble to allocate CB funds, with availability in constant flux. The issue is sometimes posed as a bipolar trade-off between training dollars and travel dollars. However, in some circumstances, if the travel dollars are not expended, the Reservists would opt out of the service, rather than absorb additional out-of-pocket costs.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-13/4200-99 (CONTINUED)

It is believed that the current 50-mile radius evolved from the COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5 definition of Areasonable commuting distance.≡ This instruction was revised in April 1997 and modifies the definition to a 100-mile radius in some circumstances (exclusive weekend drillers) and 50-miles for other units (para 402d(2)). Paragraph 402 is actually addressed only to Enlisted Transfers. Subparagraph d is addressed to surface units only. The Contract Berthing instruction, COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1, Section 5, Chapter 1, was revised in January 1998, but retains the 50-mile radius.

Increased competition for senior officer billets results in increased Aunreasonable≡ commuting for many officers.

Numerous methods to reduce this expenditure were suggested including changing the 50-mile eligibility to 100 miles, and requiring that drills start after 0900 to allow Saturday morning travel (and saving Friday night berthing expense). The Marine Corps Reserve uses this policy. Other services may not face the same level of difficulty because of ready access to military housing at most of their drill sites. Also, the one-unit structure of other service Reserve programs lends itself more to a revised schedule.

Flex drilling may further complicate this issue. The CB instruction requires that 8 hours of drill be performed before or after the berthing expense is incurred; or 4 hour drills be performed in a 48-hour period.

There is not statutory restriction to performing more than 2 drills in a day. It may be desirable to allow three drills to be performed in a day or 6-7 drills on a weekend in certain circumstances. Federal statutes require drills to be at least 2 hours in duration. In the 1930s, the Navy allowed 3 1 2 hour drills to be performed in a day. In 1956, the Comptroller General issued guidance approving multiple drills in a day. It is not DOD policy that if multiple drills are performed, then they must be at least 4 hours each, and there must be no more than 2 drills performed a day. It is believed that this policy is designed to limit public misperception of Reservists receiving multiple days= pay for a single day=s work, even though the actual compensation formula is 1/30th of a month=s pay per drill performed.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-13/4200-99 (CONTINUED)

Any policy change in this area will have differential impacts on different groups: officers/enlisted, senior/junior, pay/non-pay, coastal/heartland. The Board has insufficient data to evaluate the effects of any change, but believe data could be collected to assist in any policy recommendation.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIX POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for further consideration. Collect information on different groups of people using CBs, cross-tabulated by distance and mode of transportation. Seek to minimize out-of-pocket costs to all Reservists, particularly those in lower pay grades, those traveling the greatest distances and those performing drills without pay.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG SIX RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Policy should be set Naval Reserve-wide to preclude inequities of having a more fiscally-conservative readiness command save money that would be transferred to one that was less conservative. The impact of one readiness command having more stringent rules than another could cause difficulties.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1 establishes policies and procedures for Inactive Duty Training (IDT) Contract Berthing (CB) of SELRES. Mileage and eligibility are well established and fully supported by COMNAVRESFOR. The underlying issue is the lack of specific or sufficient funding for berthing. The shortfall is handled via continuing reviews and transfer of funds between programs. This method does not provide for sound planning and fiscal responsibility.

With the increased emphasis on SELRES billets being more closely aligned with the gaining command location, increases in CB costs will continue to rise. It is the consensus of this Board that CB funding be priority issue and resourced adequately.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration and exploration of funding initiatives.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**ITEM:** I-3-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-04/5312-99

**SUBJECT:** JOINT WARFARE DESIGNATOR FOR TAR AND SELRES OFFICERS

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Douglas W. Swanson  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island  
(360) 257-8429

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** In recent times, the services have placed an increasing emphasis on joint warfare designations to reflect a corresponding change in the character of U.S. military operations. At the same time, Naval Reserve policy and structure has changed to make the Force more relevant and seamlessly integrated with the regular Navy, with contributory support replacing mobilization readiness as priority one. For the Naval Reserve to be effective in providing contributory support to gaining commands, members must mirror their regular Navy counterparts in terms of skills and qualifications. Given that, an apparent disparity exists in the area of joint warfare designations.

While the regular Navy has a well-defined program for qualifying and recognizing joint duty, the Reserve Force has no such program. The program consists of education and experience, which lead to Additional Qualification Designations (AQDs). Joint qualification is deemed essential for promotion to higher grades and is important in detailing qualified individuals to critical billets. While the Reserve Force has Selected Reserve and TAR officers serving in joint commands and performing joint duty, they have no defined means of qualifying or tracking individual experience and education. In short, when we look in the joint mirror, there is no reflection.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Research the regular Navy program for Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) and duplicate that program for the TAR officer community.
2. Develop an appropriate joint designation program for Selected Reserve officers, with due regard to the limitations on time.
3. Review TAR and Selected Reserve officer billets to determine which require or fulfill joint qualifications.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-04/5312-99 (CONTINUED)

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Douglas W. Swanson

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur with the discussion above.

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward this discussion item to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**CO, NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Board=s recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Joint Warfare designation and Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) continues to be an issue for the SELRES and FTS as evidenced in its reoccurrence at the 1996, 1997 and 1999 Policy Board. The 1996 and 1997 Boards recommended no further action be taken. However, we found that reconsideration of this issue is warranted as Total Force support through joint operations becomes a more important operational issue for the Reserve Force components. Although the Fleet has a prescribed program identifying billets and educational requirements for joint service, the Reserve Force components have no established program or requirements for its SELRES or FTS officers to attain the same JPME qualifications.

Joint warfare military experience and/or education is becoming increasingly necessary for FTS and SELRES personnel. This is manifested in the ever-increasing joint operations supported by commissioned and augment units, FTS assignments at joint commands, and in the desirability of general joint warfare knowledge and experience to enhance support for gaining commands and Reserve support commands (COMNAVRESFOR, COMNAVSURFRESFOR, COMNAVAIRESFOR). There are avenues available to FTS and SELRES officers by which initial JMPE requirements can be achieved (Naval War College Residential and the War College of Continuing Education in Fleet concentration areas). Advanced JPME availability is extremely limited. JPME for the FTS and SELRES is pursued at the officer's initiative versus a command billet requirement.

The Board concludes that JPME and joint warfare military experience is a critical necessity for Reserve officers, both FTS and SELRES, to support the Fleet and joint commands. Given the recent initiatives in AUIC visibility and Force shaping efforts,



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-04/5312-99 (CONTINUED)

a defined career path and/or program is needed, which identifies joint billets and provides increased opportunities for JPME paralleling the Fleet.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**ITEM:** I-4-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-07/7000-99

**SUBJECT:** ADVANCE DRILL PAY RECOUPMENT UPON SUBSEQUENT RECALL TO  
ACTIVE DUTY

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Donna Hopkins  
CO, NR USACOM 206  
NAVMARCORESCEN Norfolk  
(757) 836-8570

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** During the first quarter of FY-98, an officer assigned to NR USACOM 206 accepted (Presidential Selected Reserve Call-up (PSRC)) orders to the USACOM Joint Endeavor Logistics Response Cell to begin during the second quarter. Knowing that the Directorate's workload exceeded its personnel resources, he performed AT and rescheduled the majority of FY-98 IDT prior to executing his second quarter PSRC orders, in order to achieve maximum contributory support to the gaining command. This action was in consonance with USACOMs precept of maximum flexible drilling with scheduling authority resident in the Directorate. However, the local Reserve center pay section flagged the officer's pay record and initiated action for recoupment of drill pay for those drills which would have normally been performed in the period during which PSRC was actually performed.

A similar action had been previously taken against an enlisted member from a different unit who had drilled in advance and was subsequently recalled under ADSW orders, on the principle that the member was being paid twice for the same days duty.

In fact, neither individual was being paid twice for the same day's duty; work was performed for pay delivered. Given the fact that PSRC is an involuntary recall (voluntary acceptance notwithstanding), chances are good that the officer will be allowed through due process to keep the drill pay. In that event, fairness becomes an issue when one individual who performed advance drills in good faith is not allowed to keep his/her drill pay, while another is, based strictly on the recall authority involved.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Revise BUPERSINST 1001.39C to reflect the precept that pay for rescheduled drills performed in response to gaining command requirements are not subject to recoupment if subsequent recall to active duty under any authority ensures.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-07/7000-99 (CONTINUED)

**ACTION OFFICERS:**

CAPT Karen T. Danis  
GEN IMA  
NAVMARCORESCEN Washington  
(703) 601-0241

CDR Philip J. Markert, Jr.  
VTU 0611  
NAVRESCEN Richmond  
(540) 885-0888

CDR (Sel) Mike Maertzig  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Six  
(703) 613-0904

DKCM Clyde Saunders  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Six  
(703) 607-5038

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIX POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The underlying issue is two-fold:

1. Individual=s cannot dependably anticipate recall to active duty; this, if they perform advance drills in good faith, they should not be penalized for accepting orders for the month(s) of the advance drills.
2. A drilling Reservist deserves to be paid for work performed, particularly if the work was performed with the expectation of remuneration.

The law gives the Secretary of the Navy the authority to rule in this matter. The policy foundation is as follows: Title 37 U.S. Code 206: This section of the U.S. Code clearly delegates authority to the ASecretary concerned= to set the Aminimum standards= for crediting drills for pay purposes and the Amaximum number of assemblies or periods of other equivalent training, instruction, duty or appropriate duties that may be counted for pay purposes in each fiscal year or in lesser periods of time.= This section is the pivotal legislative policy governing this pay issue. One can trace its roots to the Militia Act of 1792, which organized the concept of pay for inactive duty training.

DOD 7000.14-R, ADOD Financial Management Regulation Volume 7A, Military Pay Policy and Procedures Active Duty and Reserve Pay,=

Section 570102. Limitation: AA member cannot accrue compensation for inactive duty training performed on a day on which also entitled to basic pay for active duty or active duty for training or on a day on which entitled to muster duty allowance.≡

Although this policy might appear to relate to the issue, a Policy Board team member who works for DFAS and writes this policy has stated that it only pertains to periods of adjacent IDT and active duty. The restriction is intended to prevent pay for drills performed on a Atravel day≡ associated with a period of active duty like AT/ADT/ADSW. The correlative Navy policy is found in Section 1405 of BUPERSINST 1001.39C. No other DOD financial management policy applies to this situation.

BUPERSINST 1001.39C:

Section 1201(2): ARescheduled IDT periods may be performed in advance of regularly scheduled unit IDT periods only if the member has sufficient obligated service, and is expected to remain in the SELRES (Pay) through the end of the month for which the advance IDT periods were rescheduled.≡

Section 1205: This section describes the concept of proration, whereby new affiliates and members Awho will discontinue drilling prior to the end of the fiscal year are only eligible to be scheduled and paid for the same prorated number of IDT periods for the time they are affiliated≡ at the rate of our IDT periods per month. The intent of this regulation seems to be to limit drills performed prior to discharge, retirement or other Astatus change≡; no section in this chapter specifically addresses mobilization or recall to active duty.

Thus, this can become an issue if a member accepts orders to ADSW, recall or retirement (or other status implying diminished participation/pay). Also, this affects new affiliates.

A related policy issue concerns the use of drill time during the fiscal year in which a Reservist transfers from the Selected Reserve to another status, like ARetired Reserve,≡ Individual Ready Reserve or Standby Reserve. These matters often apply to members who have accumulated a wealth of valuable background. The Department of Defense could benefit from reports, analyses or other specialized contributions of the Navy=s senior members before they leave its ranks.

The policy options include:

1. Give Reserve activities a set of Aadditional duty≅ days which they can use to compensate Reservists who find themselves in the situation of accepting orders for months covered by advance drills. Since this situation is relatively unusual, this option might be adequate. We understand that the Marine Corps employs a variation of this system. Furthermore, COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5C, Chapter 8, addresses a related issue of pay for Aadditional IDT periods.≅

Pro: This would have minimum impact on the existing policy foundation.

Con: Administering this additional pot of money will be an extra burden. Furthermore, since this funding will be limited, this option limits the flexibility of the gaining command to use its Reserve assets, adds at least one administrative step and does not directly address the broader issue of proration.

2. Modify Navy policy to eliminate the ruling concerning proration of drill time when members begin ADSW/ADT or are mobilized. Permit gaining commands to employ Reservists as necessary; allow gaining commands to determine how much time they need and compensate Reservists accordingly. The Secretary of the Navy has the authority to make this change and this does appear to be consistent with the intent of BUPERSINST 1001.39C.

Pro: As long as the Navy has budgeted the Reservist=s drill pay, and no one fills that vacant billet, there should be no additional cost. This corrects the inequity of having a Reservist do work which benefits the gaining command, the pay for such is pulled back when the member accepts orders to active duty. This gives the gaining command some flexibility in using Reservists and does not penalize the member. It is the opinion of the Action Officer team that individuals will, as a rule, have limited amounts of time to perform these Aextra≅ drills; this will act as a self-limiting factor to guard against abuse of the system.

Con: If a billet is back-filled, the Navy=s expenses for drill pay increase marginally. This can happen only if the member accepts orders which would take him/her out of a paid billet for

more than 179 days in a 12-month period. Members who are transferring into a less active status (e.g., retirement, Standby Reserve) will not benefit, nor will their gaining commands.

3. Modify Navy policy to eliminate the blanket policy concerning proration of drill time, except for application to new affiliates. Permit gaining commands to employ Reservists as necessary; allow gaining commands to determine how much time they need and compensate Reservists accordingly. The Secretary of the Navy has the authority to make this change and this is consistent with the increasing support for providing the highest quality of contributory support for the gaining command.

Pro: Same as Option #2, with the following addition: This gives the gaining command maximum flexibility to tap into the wealth of knowledge Reservists have assembled over the course of their careers, the invaluable talent base of the Reserve community.

Con: Same as Option #2, with the following addition: This corrects the inequity and goes beyond; one might view this additional broadening as unnecessary and likely to increase vulnerability to abuse.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIX POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Accept Option #2. Modify Naval Reserve policy to eliminate the ruling concerning proration of drill time when members begin ADSW/ADT or are mobilized. The law permits this change and funding impacts should be minimal.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG SIX RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. All Reservists should be paid for 48 drills if 48 drills can be performed. Active duty, in whatever form and for whatever length, should be the reason for drills to be rescheduled, but not preclude payment for those drills due to its duration. Reservists should be paid for work performed.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The efforts of the Naval Reserve Force to have the right Reservist in the right place, with the right equipment, at the right time, to meet the call of the gaining command is, and will remain, the focal point of our mission. To meet our customers' needs, changes such as Aflex and incremental drills have been incorporated. However, the pro-rating of IDT periods limits the member's ability to perform contributory support and meet gaining command requests

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-07/7000-99 (CONTINUED)

and requirements. The Board concludes that SELRES should not be penalized for performing IDT in advance of departing for ADT, ADSW or PSRC when meeting our customers' needs.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with NAVRESREDCOMREG SIX Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**ITEM:** I-5-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-03/7000-99

**SUBJECT:** RETIREMENT PAY (50% VS. 40%)

**SUBMITTED BY:** LT Shields  
NAF Washington  
(240) 857-5504

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** 50% retirement benefits vs. 40% after 20 years of service. This is a major retention issue.

**RECOMMENDATION:** 50% retirement pay for all Sailors.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Evan  
ASP 1366  
NAF Washington

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Restore the 50% retirement benefit for everyone. Make this request via the Defense Appropriations Bill in Congress.

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAF WASHINGTON RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for action.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** This issue has a significant impact on retention and recruiting. The Board supports every effort to return retirement benefits to 50 percent after 20 years vice 40 percent. If approved, current proposed Congressional legislation, S.4, the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Marines Bill of Rights Act of 1999, will restore retirement benefits to 50 percent.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration and follow-up in light of present Congressional efforts.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.



**ITEM:** I-6-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** FL-07/7000-99

**SUBJECT:** SPACE AA≡ TRAVEL FOR RETIRED ("GRAY AREA") SELRES

**SUBMITTED BY:** PN1 William O'Donnell  
NR HASW  
NAVAIRES Jacksonville  
DSN 942-3320, ext 130

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Selected Reservists that are transferred to the Retired Reserve list without pay are not entitled to Space AA≡ travel overseas.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Selected Reservists not entitled to pay, but who have been issued a Notice of Eligibility (NOE) to receive retired pay at age 60, should be given the same privilege as a retiree.

**ACTION OFFICER:** PNC Ellen Harris  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
DSN 942-3320, ext 332

**NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Selected Reservists serve this country honorably and with personal sacrifice. Our Reservists should be given the same privilege to travel Space AA≡ during their so-called Agray period.≡

**NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**CO, NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** OPNAVINST 4630.25 governs Navy policy on Space "A" travel for military personnel, including retirees, and is derived directly from DOD Directive 4500.9. The Board concluded that this is a valid, no cost addition to the benefit package that "gray area" Reservists have earned through their service.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**ITEM:** I-7-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-04/7000-99

**SUBJECT:** PRE-TAX ACCOUNT FOR DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSE INCURRED  
DURING DRILL PERIODS OR ACTIVE DUTY

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Kevin Spalding  
NR NAVAIRPAC 1094  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 553-4009

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Many drilling Reservists are single parents or spouses of active duty members on deployment who must pay for child/dependent care during drill periods or Annual Training. These expenses place an additional burden on drilling Reservists in the above categories. The Tax Code already provides for flexible spending accounts to allow pre-tax dollars to be withheld from pay to cover these expenses.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Reservists should be allowed to have a portion of their Reserve pay deducted on a pre-tax basis and put into a dependent care flexible spending account. Reservists would submit an expense report with appropriate documentation to their processing center for reimbursement out of the account. While this system might add some additional administrative cost to the processing center, it could be paid for out of savings the Navy will realize in not paying the 7.65% FICA on the individual=s pre-tax holding. We believe this would be a benefit that saves the Navy money, improves the individual=s morale and enables more people to drill.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Kevin Spalding

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** This is a quality of life issue for active duty and Selected Reservists alike. We concur with the recommendation and believe this benefit should include both active duty and Selected Reserve personnel.

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** To petition Congress to change the Tax Code to include this benefit for both active duty and Selected Reserve personnel.

**CO, NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the recommendation of the Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-04/7000-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board concurs that this is a quality of life issue for both Active and Reserve Forces, and additionally that this is a benefit allowed by the Internal Revenue Service tax code and provided for many in the civilian work force.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**ITEM:** I-8-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-07/7000-99

**SUBJECT:** VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCE (VHA) FOR SELRES

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Kevin Spalding  
NR NAVAIRPAC 1094  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 553-4009

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** When a Selected Reservist is recalled to active duty their VHA does not become effective until after 140 days after the start of the recall period. This can have a serious impact on income particularly in high cost of living areas such as San Diego.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Pay VHA to Selected Reservists who are recalled to active duty beyond 30 days instead of the current 140 days.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Paul M. Shaw  
NR NAVAIRPAC 1094  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 423-6456

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Selected Reservists should be entitled, when recalled over 30 days, to the same benefits as their active duty counterparts.

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Change existing policies to pay any Selected Reservist who is recalled more than 30 days the assigned VHA.

**CO, NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the recommendation of the Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The FY98 DOD Authorization Act eliminated the VHA entitlement for all military members effective 31 December 1997. These statutory provisions allow the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) to set a temporary Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) for Reservists. SECDEF created a BAH Type II rate for members called to active duty for 139 days or less effective 1 January 1998. Therefore, the member must be called or ordered to active duty for a contingency, or for a prospective period of 140 days to qualify for BAH Type I. SECDEF now has the authority to set both BAH I and II rates.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-07/7000-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration, requesting that SELRES recalled to active duty for periods of greater than 30 days, but not less than 140 days, be entitled to BAH Type I rates.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

## CATEGORY II

### 1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD

<u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>ORIGINATOR NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
II-1	SD-02/1000-99	REINSTITUTION OF THE OFFICER QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE (OQQ)
II-2	01-02/1610-99	GAINING COMMANDERS AS REPORTING SENIORS ON UNIT LEVEL FITNESS REPORTS (FITREPs)
II-3	16-03/1001-99	WORK AT HOME - DRILLS PERFORMED AT HOME OR LOCAL RESERVE SITE
II-4	19-05/1020-99	UNIFORMS FOR EXERCISES (See Note on page II-2)
II-5	VA-03/1020-99	UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR E6 AND BELOW
II-6	04-07/1513-99 04-09/1500-99 08-14/1500-99 PM-02/1500-99	ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG)/ ACCELERATED INITIAL ACCESSION (AIA) PROGRAM
II-7	04-11/1513-99	APG SWIM QUALIFICATIONS
II-8	WA-06/1570-99	STREAMLINING RESCHEDULED DRILL ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS
II-9	01-04/3060-99	ACTIVE DUTY FOR SPECIAL WORK (ADSW) PROCESSING
II-10	04-05/4650-99	TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SELRES
II-11	08-11/5230-99 08-24/1430-99	SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE NAVAL RESERVE ADVANCEMENT TRACKING SYSTEM (NAVRATS) AND PRT PROGRAM
II-12	WA-03/5230-99	COMMON WEB PAGE HOSTING
II-13	WA-02/5270-99	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AUGMENT UNITS
II-14	08-03/6000-99	ACTIVE DUTY TRAINING (ADT) FUNDING FOR MEDICAL UNITS/PERSONNEL

<u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>ORIGINATOR NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
II-15	SD-05/6000-99	RESERVISTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO JOIN THE MEDICAL PLAN ESTABLISHED FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS
II-16	16-05/7000-99	GOVERNMENT RATE AIR TRAVEL
II-17	08-06/11000-99	FACILITY MANAGER BILLET AT NAVAL RESERVE ACTIVITIES

Note:      *Item II-4 was revised to a Category I by the 1999  
COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board Mid-Year Review.*

**ITEM:** II-1-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-02/1000-99

**SUBJECT:** REINSTITUTION OF THE OFFICER QUALIFICATION  
QUESTIONNAIRE (OQQ)

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Mark T. Miller  
CO, NR NAVAIRWINGSPAC 0194  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(360) 293-1243

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The OQQ was originally an official Naval Reserve document that was maintained in an officer=s service record. It provided a precise, plain language review of an officer=s civilian status and a chronological listing of his/her active duty and Reserve billet assignments, plus his/her Reserve AT/ADT assignments and duties. In the early 1990s, this document was canceled and the Naval Reserve Qualification Questionnaire (NRQQ) became the sole document in use.

In spite of the fact that it is no longer a current form, the OQQ is still a requested document when submitting packages for most selection boards. When filled in, it is the best single source document in representing an officer=s history of naval participation. There is still a strong requirement for this questionnaire.

**RECOMMENDATION:** In light of the continued use of the OQQ in conducting official Naval Reserve business, it is strongly recommended that the Naval Reserve return it to an active status. It is an excellent form and provides a central source for presenting a clear and concise personal history.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CAPT Mark T. Miller

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Although the NRQQ is an abbreviated history of a member=s career and is sent to the member for update annually, it lacks the detail of the OQQ. Most Reservists possess an electronic copy of their OQQ and use it as their main Reserve resume when applying for billets, statutory board, etc., since the OQQ is an all-inclusive document.

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR reinstate use of the OQQ.

**CO, NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the recommendation of the Board.



ORIGINATOR NUMBER: SD-02/1000-99 (CONTINUED)

1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION: The OQQ provided essential military and civilian information, not available in the NRQQ, but useful to various selection boards. The request for reinstitution of the OQQ has merit and should be reviewed for implementation.

1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION: COMNAVRESFOR include possible reinstitution of the OQQ in their review of Naval Reserve selection board requirements.

COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION: Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N1 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-2-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 01-02/1610-99

**SUBJECT:** GAINING COMMANDERS AS REPORTING SENIORS ON UNIT LEVEL  
FITNESS REPORTS (FITREPs)

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR John H. Booth  
NAVRESREDCOMREG One  
(401) 841-2455

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Guidance in BUPERSINST 1610.10 creates a separate reporting senior for Naval Reserve officers. Currently, officers are reported on annually by their unit CO/OIC or the Reserve Center CO or Readiness Commander. In most cases these reporting seniors would not be the normal reporting senior at the gaining command. In fact, current practice would be analogous to having the OIC of PERSUPPDET write FITREPs on commanders of operational units they support. The gaining command needs to take on the responsibility of reporting on the fitness of officers assigned. In addition, this would eliminate need for not observed FITREPs for officers on annual training (AT) at their gaining command. The reporting senior for Reserve officers should be the same as if they were mobilized to their gaining command. This practice would increase marginally the administrative requirements on the gaining commands--most of the administrative work would still be done by the Reserve unit--however it increases dramatically the ownership and influence they exert over their SELRES officer assets.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Change guidance in BUPERSINST 1610.10 to reflect the reporting senior for Reserve officers to be the gaining command reporting senior for their billet.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CAPT Mary Ann Rowe  
NAVMARCORESCEN Providence  
(401) 941-9262

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ONE POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The NAVRESREDCOMREG One Policy Board concurs that the responsibility for accomplishing fitness reports on Selected Reserve officers should reside with the gaining command vice the ISIC in the Reserve Force chain of command. The advantages associated with changing this policy include: a greater ownership of the officer by the gaining command (representing fuller integration with active duty counterparts) and a more accurate assessment of that officer's mobilization potential by a reporting senior who has observed that officer's performance in the assigned mobilization billet.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 01-02/1610-99 (CONTINUED)

This is consistent with reporting senior responsibilities already in place in medical, construction and submarine force programs.

We recognize that this issue, if adopted, will require substantial revisions to (annexes J and L of) BUPERSINST 1610.10 (Series). This change will place increased administrative demands on the gaining commands which the leadership within the augmentation unit must be responsible to facilitate. Under this change, unit COs will retain the responsibility for mid-term counseling. Unit COs should be required to provide SMOOTH-rough fitness reports on all officers under their command to the gaining command reporting senior. These smooth-rough fitness reports should comment on PRT data, IDT drills not performed at the gaining command and other performance issues not under the direct line of sight of the reporting senior.

When BUPERSINST 1610.10 is reissued, we recommend that the periodicity (end dates) for Reserve officers be realigned to coincide with the USN report dates.

We recognize that the NRA CO will experience a loss of leverage over the assigned units but concur that this disadvantage will be well compensated by improved utilization and evaluation of Reserve officers which this policy item represents.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ONE POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward with the recommendation that the Chief of Naval Personnel (PersB9) reissue BUPERSINST 1610.10, mandating responsibility for SELRES officer fitness reports be transferred to the active component and that periodicity be realigned to coincide with dates established for USN officers.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG ONE RECOMMENDATION:** Do not concur with Policy Board recommendation, however, recommend modify existing policy to that gaining commands act as concurrent reporting senior on their Reserve officer fitness reports.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Although there is merit to having gaining commands report on officers assigned to them, there is a chain of command issue that needs to be addressed. It is the responsibility of the unit commanding officer to maintain good order and discipline. All officers and enlisted personnel ultimately report to the CO. There are other venues provided in BUPERSINST 1610.10 to account for an officer's performance away from the unit (i.e., PIM, the officer's input and correspondence with the gaining command).

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 01-02/1610-99 (CONTINUED)

It is the consensus of the Board that the gaining command should report concurrently on unit commanding officers. This will exert the ownership influence discussed by the originator. Per COMNAVSURFRESFORINST 1610.1, when appropriate, orderwriting authorities are to assign Reserve officers additional duty to the gaining command. This provides for the gaining command's commanding officer to be the concurrent reporting senior. It is noted that compliance with this guidance is not consistent throughout the Naval Reserve.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR review fitness report policy on concurrent reporting on unit commanding officers and ensure consistency throughout the Force.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N1 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-3-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 16-03/1001-99

**SUBJECT:** WORK AT HOME - DRILLS PERFORMED AT HOME OR LOCAL  
RESERVE SITE

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Cheryl D. Duft  
CO, NR USSTRATCOM Det 1362  
NAVMARCORESCEN Omaha  
(314) 621-3639

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Currently, some kinds of work, such as that performed by public affairs officers, could be done at a Reservists home. The active duty or accountable superior could document performance.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Grant the ability to perform duty at home, when appropriate, saving airfare, per diem and car rental costs. With the availability of fax machines, e-mail and phones, communication is available where presence is not needed.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CAPT Cheryl D. Duft

**NAVMARCORESCEN OMAHA POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Providing there are reasonable safeguards against abusive practices and when a Reservists physical presence at a specific location is not otherwise beneficial, it may be advantageous to give drill credit to SELRES for certain types of Naval Reserve work that they perform equally well, or better and more efficiently, from alternate work sites (i.e., office or home).

**NAVMARCORESCEN OMAHA POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:**  
COMNAVSURFRESFOR should consider the advantages to the Naval Reserve Force of giving drill credit to Reservists performing essential official tasks at non-conventional drill sites and develop appropriate guidelines.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIXTEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Enough guidelines are in place to viably address this option, however, there are other considerations, such as legality issues, pertaining to the member during that period. This is considered to be an off-site drill, which is already covered in the Master Training Plan. Further investigation by a JAG officer is required to determine the liability issues involved.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIXTEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 16-03/1001-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG SIXTEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR Staff Judge Advocate has expressed the opinion that unit COs currently have the authority to approve off-site drilling, including drills at home or business. COMNAVRESFOR (N1) has initiated a study to determine the feasibility of this program. A pilot program has been established with the Individual Voluntary Training Unit at NAS Atlanta, which will be conducting off-site drills, including drills at home and at places of business (virtual drilling). The Air Force Reserve currently conducts drills off-site, including at a member's home. COMNAVRESFOR (N12) has obtained copies of instructions governing Air Force procedures for this type of drill and the results of the Pilot Program at NAS Atlanta. This information will be used as background information to assist in preparation of procedures and policy guidance if implementation by COMNAVRESFOR is directed.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR monitor progress of this study with special consideration given to ensuring quantifying the work required for compensation and muster procedures to prevent perceived or actual abuse.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N1 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-4-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-05/1020-99

**SUBJECT:** UNIFORMS FOR EXERCISES

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR L. E. Dove  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach  
(310) 732-5742

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** There is a significant number of requests from the 5th and 7th Fleet AOR for SELRES support on exercises. In these areas, either the desert or woodland camouflage uniform is required. It is COMNAVSURFRESFOR policy that they will not purchase or issue these uniforms to personnel unless their unit is authorized to wear them. In most cases, the requesting command also will not provide them. Many SELRES, going the extra mile, will go out and buy these uniforms just to support the exercise. Although admirable, this is wrong. The senior echelons need to resolve this issue so our Sailors do not have to buy the uniforms out-of-pocket.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That COMNAVSURFRESFOR work with the fleet commands to resolve the issue of who should furnish uniforms for exercise support. If the decision is made not to furnish them, then SELRES should be allowed to deploy in their standard work uniform.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR L. E. Dove

**NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** SELRES personnel performing AT/ADT should report to the gaining command in the proper uniform to be worn while on AT/ADT. When these AT/ADT orders are in support of 5th and 7th Fleet exercises, SELRES should automatically be authorized issue of the desert or woodland camouflage uniform, regardless of their drilling unit. It is the position of this Board that it is the responsibility of COMNAVSURFRESFOR to authorize these uniforms in support of such exercises.

**NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen Policy Board.

**CO, NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Policy Board agreed with the CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach recommendation.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-05/1020-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is recommended.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR Instruction P4000.1 describes the provisions for wearing the camouflage utility uniform (CUU). Authorized units are established by higher authority and the authority to wear these uniforms is specifically tied to the authorized unit. Military members not assigned to one of these units are prohibited from purchasing and wearing the CUU as an optional uniform.

Uniform proscription within an Area of Responsibility (AOR) resides directly with the Area Commander. Numerous Selected Reserves are being ordered to these areas in Exercise Support roles and are finding themselves without the designated uniform. It is the consensus of this Board that ordering a member to an area and then requiring him/her to purchase a uniform that will be unsuitable for wear upon return is not appropriate.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR review and establish procedures and policies which alleviate the financial burden upon the service members where the CUU uniform is required for AOR exercise support.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N4 review this item and take appropriate action.



**ITEM:** II-5-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** VA-03/1020-99

**SUBJECT:** UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR E6 AND BELOW

**SUBMITTED BY:** MSC Laura M. Kuch  
GVTU 8686G  
NAVAIRES Norfolk  
(757) 471-1887

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The current system requires all E6 and below to perform a one-for-one exchange for all uniform items after the initial issue. This results in excessive time and paperwork in supply and causes an undo burden on the Reservist who must make several trips to NAVAIRES to order, fit and then pick up the item (three trips). These trips also take Reservists away from their gaining commands.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Issue an annual uniform allowance for E6 and below as is done now for E7 and above.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LT D. L. Dennis  
NAVAIRES Norfolk (N72)  
(757) 444-1494; DSN 564-1494

**NAVAIRES NORFOLK POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The NAVAIRES supply chief indicated to the Board that each one-for-one exchange results in 40-45 minutes of paperwork. The Board was also informed that uniform items can be mail ordered from NEXCOM and can be delivered to the Reservist by mail. This eliminates a significant burden on the Reservists who live outside the local area. An annual uniform allowance issued on the member=s anniversary month that is prorated from the active duty allowance would eliminate much of the burden on the Reservists and on the Supply Departments. The allowance would also curtail any illegal exchanges that may occur and save COMNAVRESFOR money in the long run.

**NAVAIRES NORFOLK POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration. The current situation could easily be changed to issue members a uniform allowance for E6 and below. Initial analysis indicates that it would reduce the administrative burden placed on supply for one-for-one exchanges and eliminate multiple trips to NAVAIRES by the Reservists to get their uniform items. This would also reduce the amount of wasted time away from the drill site for Reservists.

**CO, NAVAIRES NORFOLK RECOMMENDATION:** Makes sense on the face of

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** VA-03/1020-99 (CONTINUED)

it and may be very cost effective.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The initiative to provide a annual clothing maintenance allowance is being actively pursued by COMNAVRESFOR. A letter of support has been forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy, via CNO (OP-095). Presently, the policy is under review by the OPNAV Resource Sponsor (N1) for support determination. Results of this review are planned for Spring of 1999.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR monitor the CMA initiative and promulgate appropriate guidance based upon the Resource Sponsor's support determination.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N4 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-6-99

**COMBINED ORIGINATOR NUMBERS:** 04-07/1513-99, 04-09/1500-99,  
08-14/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99

**SUBJECT:** ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG)/ACCELERATED INITIAL ACCESSION  
(AIA) PROGRAM

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** There are many issues related to the APG/AIA program that should be examined. The issues range from logistics, i.e., quota availability and sequence of training, to the suggestion that the program be abandoned in favor of the traditional Boot Camp experience.

The APG/AIA program is designed to meet Naval Reserve end strength goals by attracting non-prior service individuals who possess critically needed skills. However, the current program is apparently not meeting the needs of the gaining commands. New APG/AIA accessions are often aboard for several months prior to attending APG/AIA school. Problems associated with swim qualifications, follow-on training, and tracking qualification progress combine to make many of the new accessions ineligible for mobilization.

Although the APG/AIA curriculum provides training in the same core competencies covered at RTC, many individuals complete the program, but lack the basic skills, such as minimum water survival qualifications, proficiency in handling shipboard emergencies, and uniform rank identification.

It is the consensus of the Board that the APG/AIA issues are broad enough in scope to warrant a comprehensive evaluation of the program designed to address the various concerns raised.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR conduct an evaluation of the entire APG/AIA program to determine its effectiveness in contributing to the Total Force.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N7 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-07/1513-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-09/1500-99,  
08-14/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)

**SUBJECT:** BOOT CAMP FOR APG'S

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Michael Goldschmidt  
XO, NAVRESCEN Fort Dix (N01)  
(609) 723-7160, ext 102

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** APG school just is not getting the job done. In several interviews I have had with APG Sailors, the members found the school valuable and necessary, but not sufficient. Many basic pieces of information are neglected, not because they are not important, but because the school is only two weeks long. Indoctrination, by its very definition, takes time.

Under the "one Navy" concept, we give lip service to there being no discernable difference between active and Reserve Sailors. How can that be true when the typical USN or TAR Sailor receives eight weeks of basic training, including physical training, close order drill, Naval customs and traditions, watchstanding, chain of command, swimming, firefighting, etc., yet new accessions to the Naval Reserve enlisted ranks receive a paltry 12 days. Many come back not knowing essential information, such as how to identify and address officers, whom to salute, how officers are different from chief petty officers, how to respond to orders, etc. Poorly prepared enlisted people embarrass us in the fleet and (is there a study on this?) may be harder to retain.

**RECOMMENDATION:** There should be no difference in recruit training requirements between active and Reserve Sailors. Send Reserve Sailors as seamen recruits to USN recruit training. Upon successful completion of accession training, release them from active duty, assign them to Reserve units and give them their advanced pay grades. Such a process gives the Naval Reserve more professional, competent and knowledgeable Sailors.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Michael Goldschmidt

**NAVRESCEN FORT DIX POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The COMNAVSURFRESFOR guidance requiring APGs to do their first AT at

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-07/1513-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-09/1500-99,  
08-14/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)  
(CONTINUED)

APG school is a good start, but does not fix the problem of undereducated petty officers. There are several considerations, including employee leave and Reserve budget, which need to be considered when adopting this proposal. Employee leave should be covered, if necessary, under reemployment rights within the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940. As for budget, if Sailors are worth recruiting, they are worth giving accession training.

**NAVRESCEN FORT DIX POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Send non-prior service USNR recruits to USN recruit training.

**ACTION OFFICER:** HTCS James S. Calandra  
NAVMARCORESCEN Fort Schuyler, Bronx  
(718) 892-0312

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** APG accessions with non-prior service should have the same basic training provided all recruits at boot camp. Therefore, a requirement for all non-prior service APG individuals should be implemented to attend boot camp at Great Lakes. This would provide uniformity in training received by all Navy personnel, active and Reserve. Upon completion of training, the Reservist would be released from active duty and continue in a drilling status. The increased cost of providing this training would be made up from the savings which will be realized by anticipated initial reduction of the number of APG accessions, cost savings from APG school problems, "wash-outs," transportation and better initial training requires less follow-up training.

For special hardship cases where qualified applicants are unable to attend boot camp, an alternative training plan, similar to the NECAP program, should be implemented. This plan should be coordinated with Great Lakes and compressed into a three-phase training plan as follows:

1. 10 drill days at a Naval Reserve activity (5 consecutive months).
2. 2 weeks APG indoctrination school.
3. 17 day AT period.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-07/1513-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-09/1500-99,  
08-14/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)  
(CONTINUED)

Coordination between RTC Great Lakes and COMNAVRESFOR would be required in the development of this curriculum.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. This problem needs to be addressed, although there is currently a change "in work" to shift APG training from New Orleans to RTC Great Lakes. This shift could solve the problem, if it occurs in a timely fashion.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-07/1513-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-09/1500-99,  
08-14/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)  
(CONTINUED)

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-09/1500-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-07/1513-99,  
08-14/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)

**SUBJECT:** APG SCHOOL/NECAP SEQUENTIAL ATTENDANCE

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Joe Waite  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Amityville  
(516) 842-4850

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The majority of HMs recruited into the Reserve require both the APG school and the NECAP school. The backlog of billets to APG school results in a potential delay of up to two years, yet the current policy requires that all personnel attend APG school prior to NECAP. This result is a Reservist having to waive their AT during their first year, followed by a billet to APG school during their AT the second year, then using their AT the third year to attend NECAP. In this scenario, a newly recruited HM may have to wait three years before they have completed both schools and are able to assist their gaining command in a useful capacity.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Allow the NRA to provide basic training for a new recruit which would provide them with a level of military knowledge adequate enough for the recruit to attend NECAP prior to APG school. This would allow a recruit to accept a billet to the first available school and should ensure both schools are completed within their first two years in the program. The end result would be properly trained Reservists providing useful support to their gaining commands as soon as possible.

**ACTION OFFICER:** HMC Mark P. Livingston  
NAVMARCORESCEN Ebensburg  
(814) 472-5083

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Both NECAP and APG school are recognized as valuable education and necessary for APG medical affiliates to obtain in order to meet the mission of the Naval Reserve. It is also recognized that the prompt, successful completion of both NECAP and APG school is in the best interest of the new affiliate, the Naval Reserve and the taxpayers.

Therefore, the recommendation that the NRA provide basic training for the new recruit in order to attend NECAP before APG school is recommended. The training should be uniform and



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-09/1500-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-07/1513-99,  
08-14/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)  
(CONTINUED)

consistent throughout the Naval Reserve and administered the first few drill weekends after the recruit affiliates. The intent of the training is not to replace APG school, but to provide the medical recruit with enough basic military knowledge to ensure they can successfully function and complete NECAP.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. This problem needs to be addressed, although there is currently a change AIN work≡ to shift APG training from New Orleans to RTC Great Lakes. This shift could solve the problem, if it occurs in a timely fashion.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-14/1500-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-07/1513-99,  
04-09/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)

**SUBJECT:** APG SCHOOL REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO ACCESSION

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR John D. Croce  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Augusta  
(706) 733-2249/0

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Recent problems with APG students= ability to meet Reserve Force requirements have focused new attention on an ongoing problem. Current recruiting efforts outwardly advertise ANO BOOT CAMP!≡ which may be sending the wrong message. If active duty feels the need for a boot camp, why shouldn't we? For many, APG school is the first formal military instruction that APGs are exposed to at the start of their Reserve careers. This indoctrination comes after considerable time, effort and money is spent on a new affiliation. Commitment to the Reserve and ability to meet physical readiness standards would be more certain following successful completion of APG school.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Make APG school the ABOOT CAMP≡ it needs to be. APGs should not report to Reserve activities until after they have successfully completed APG school. Those who fail the APG standards do not affiliate. The same can be applied to Direct Commissioned Officer school (except for SELRES who have fleeted up from enlisted ranks).

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR J.D. Carr  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Eight  
(904) 542-2486

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** APG school is a ABoot Camp≡ for APGs and is adequate training taking into account realistic budgetary requirements and the availability of the APG member. The problem is that securing timely APG school quotas has been difficult. This has been partially alleviated by commencement of a second APG course at Gulfport, MS. Improvements in the process could include making the APG school quota reservation part of the recruiting process. A recruiter could secure the quota and the APG would sign an acknowledgment that he/she would be going to school on the date reserved. A PQS system should also be developed similar to other PQS systems to ensure the APG satisfies all training requirements.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-14/1500-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-07/1513-99,  
04-09/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)  
(CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration. Reserve recruiters should secure a quota for APG school during the recruiting process and before the new APG is released to the Reserve activity or unit. An APG PQS booklet should be developed to ensure the APG satisfies all training requirements, including pre and post APG school.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-14/1500-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-07/1513-99,  
04-09/1500-99, AND PM-02/1500-99)  
(CONTINUED)

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-02/1500-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-07/1513-99,  
04-09/1500-99, AND 08-14/1500-99)

**SUBJECT:** ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG)/ACCELERATED INITIAL ACCESSION  
(AIA) PROGRAM INTEGRATION WITH RECRUIT  
TRAINING COMMAND (RTC) BOOT CAMP PROGRAM

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR E. C. Veramendi  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Upon the possible 2-week (Annual Training)  
integration of the APG/AIA program with RTCs boot camp program,  
calendar year 1999 of FY-00, the following concerns exist:

1. Naval Reserve APG personnel initiate training wearing the  
respective E4-E6 crowns amidst boot camp personnel who do not  
wear any rate insignia.
2. Naval Reserve APG/AIA personnel do not have a monetary  
stipend to pay for PT gear provided by RTC and cannot afford the  
respective monetary deduction from their pay following  
completion of their AT.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The following recommendations apply for  
seamless integration of APG personnel into RTCs boot camp  
program:

1. To ensure fair and equitable treatment for all, rewrite the  
APG instruction, considering any one of the following options:
  - a. Initiate time-in-rate waivers to include incremental  
advancements to the next authorized pay grade upon completion of  
advancement requirements. Incidentally, recoupment procedures  
are not currently in place for personnel failing to complete  
requirements.
  - b. Upon completion of initial AT (boot camp), APG personnel  
would be frocked to their temporary pay grade.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-02/1500-99 (COMBINED WITH 04-07/1513-99,  
04-09/1500-99, AND 08-14/1500-99)  
(CONTINUED)

c. Advance APG personnel retroactively to authorized pay grades either upon completion of boot camp or completion of all advancement requirements for the next pay grade.

2. If wearing temporary E4-E6 crowns remains authorized, APG personnel should be positioned as Asquad leaders within the respective RTC boot camp environment.

3. Naval Reserve Force should transfer funding to RTC boot camp program to pay for APG/AIA members PT gear provided by RTC, or establish a clothing advance for APG/AIA personnel so they may pay for the RTC-sanctioned PT gear.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendations.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, recommending option 1.c. above for integrating APG/AIA personnel at boot camp. The precedent for putting APG/DEP personnel in leadership positions, despite lack of prior service, already exists within other services. A PT gear funding provision should be made to ensure Naval Reserve personnel remain as Total Force members.

**ITEM:** II-7-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-11/1513-99

**SUBJECT:** APG SWIM QUALIFICATIONS

**SUBMITTED BY:** LT C. J. Gallen  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Four  
(609) 724-7733

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** APG personnel are recruited into the Reserve without going through Navy recruit training. There is a two-week school in New Orleans that they go to so they can complete their accession level training. When they are recruited, they are not told by recruiting that there is a requirement to pass a swim test.

In the active Navy, they are taught how to swim in recruit training. APG school (boot camp) is only 12 days long, which precludes actually teaching swimming and only allows for testing. The latest figures from APG school reveal that 85% of the drops from the class are because of swimming.

We still have to pay to send these people to New Orleans and have them stay there for a couple of days, after which they get sent home. There already is a severe shortage of quotas at APG school and this only exasperates the problem.

No level of the chain of command is assigned to teach swimming to APGs. Most activities do not have the facilities or instructors to teach swimming. There is not enough demand to justify spending civilian augmented training (CAT) money to rent facilities and instructors.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Establish a policy that assigns responsibility for swim training for APGs.

**ACTION OFFICER:** DCC(SW) Nicholas J. Ahart  
NAVMARCORESCEN Brooklyn  
(718) 258-0258

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Current policy is to send the APG who fails swimming qualifications back to the NRA and put the responsibility on the NRA to teach swimming within 90-120 days. Most NRAs do not have access to a pool or instructor. Suggest either incorporating remedial swimming to APGs curriculum, make swimming qualifications a requirement prior to enlisting and make recruiters teach or contract swimming for their applicants.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-11/1513-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. This problem needs to be addressed, although there is currently a change Ain work≡ to shift APG training from New Orleans to RTC Great Lakes. This shift could solve the problem, if it occurs in a timely fashion.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Following submission of this issue, COMNAVRESFOR has published guidance to the field through COMNAVRESFOR 221202Z Jan 99. COMNAVRESFOR N7 expects changes to the Navy swim policy by CNO and will update current COMNAVRESFOR accession policy as required.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR track status of expected changes to CNOs swim policy and initiate new policy guidance if required.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N7 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-8-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-06/1570-99

**SUBJECT:** STREAMLINING RESCHEDULED DRILL ADMINISTRATIVE  
REQUIREMENTS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR G. L. Bennett  
NR NCIS 2422  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island  
(425) 746-3499

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The current weekend drill mustering process is unnecessarily time consuming, taking away valuable man-hours that could be devoted to providing contributory fleet support. On the specific problem of rescheduled drills, it was brought up that for some units, especially those drilling away from the normal drill site and performing a large number of rescheduled drills, an enormous amount of time is consumed by sending faxes, obtaining signatures from COs/PMs, return faxes and, finally, mustering and submission of completed paperwork. Given that contributory fleet support is a very high priority, the number and percentage of drilling Reservists on rescheduled drills will only increase in the future, possibly dramatically, and the need for a streamlined, more efficient process for rescheduled drills would be beneficial to the Naval Reserve Force.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend the weekend drill mustering system currently in place be replaced with a system similar to that currently employed by the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, a Apay by exception system; for reschedule drills. Recommend a study be initiated by COMNAVRESFOR to explore ways of streamlining the process while ensuring pay accountability is not compromised.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Robert J. Tate  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island Manpower Officer  
(360) 257-6942

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board agreed that the mustering system should be replaced by a Apay by exception system already in place with the Marine Corps Reserve. Rescheduled drills were considered to be difficult to manage and the consensus was that a system could be devised to ensure pay accountability was maintained yet afford ease of use.

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward this discussion item to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**CO, NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded.



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-06/1570-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Drill accounting and administrative requirements are presently being reviewed by the Manpower Departments of COMNAVRESFOR, COMNAVAIRESFOR and COMNAVSURFRESFOR in an effort to identify means to streamline procedures. Rescheduled drills and additional drills are the focus of the review. Proposals have been made by this group to reduce the steps required to schedule and complete both rescheduled and additional drills.

The issue of a Apay by exception≡ drill muster and pay system is currently before the Naval Reserve Force Executive Steering Committee (ESC). The main issues before the ESC pertaining to Apay by exception≡ are:

a. The Naval Reserve Drill Pay (NRDP) system, operated by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS), and its follow-on system, Defense Joint Military Pay System-Reserve Component (DJMS-RC), are both Apositive transaction≡ driven and require individual input for pay.

b. DJMS-RC will be used by the Navy, Army, Air Force, National Guard and Air Guard, and any changes would require agreement by all of the services. The U.S. Marine Corps Reserve is not part of DJMS-RC, and its present pay system is operating under a waiver.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR monitor status of Tri-Staff (COMNAVRESFOR/COMNAVSURFRESFOR/COMNAVAIRESFOR) Manpower Deputy Chiefs of Staff (N1) initiatives to reduce the steps required to reschedule and complete both rescheduled and additional drills and also monitor the status/findings of the Naval Reserve Force ESC regarding "pay by exception" decisions.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N1 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-9-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 01-04/3060-99

**SUBJECT:** ACTIVE DUTY FOR SPECIAL WORK (ADSW) PROCESSING

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR John H. Booth  
NAVRESREDCOMREG One  
(401) 841-2455

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Recent and proposed changes to the BUPERS instructions call for processing of Reservists recalled on ADSW at centralized LACMOB sites throughout the country. These changes have taken responsibility for mobilizing Reservists from the Reserve center and placed in the hands of active duty commands as a collateral duty. This process increases mobilization times and costs to the gaining commands and creates many inconveniences to the Reservists. Reserve centers working with REDCOMs and properly trained PERSUPPDETs are where this process should take place and has successfully taken place in the past.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Change BUPERS guidance and allow Reserve centers to mobilize Reservists on ADSW up to 179 days vice sending them to LACMOBs.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CAPT Mary Ann Rowe  
NAVMARCORESCEN Providence  
(401) 941-9262

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ONE POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The fourteen Naval Mobilization Processing sites have operated with varying levels of success since their inception shortly after ODS. Their original mission was to standardize the mobilization process and alleviate the burden placed on often remote Naval Reserve activities in times of Presidential Selected Reserve Call-up involving recall of large numbers of Reservists. This mission has now expanded to include mobilizing even individual Reservists recalled for any period of active duty greater than 30 days. This process has frequently been inefficient, duplicated processes which Naval Reserve activities are entirely competent to complete and inhibited access to the Reservists by the gaining command.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ONE POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward with the recommendation that responsibility for mobilizing Reservists for ADSW be returned to Naval Reserve Activities (NRAs).

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG ONE RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with Policy Board discussion and recommendation.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 01-04/3060-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** ADSW processing through NMPS has proven to be an expensive evolution for the gaining command in both travel costs and mandays. In November 1998, NPC-9 recommended to CNO (N1) that this processing requirement be eliminated, with the exception of ADSW for contingency operations. A revision to OPNAVINST 1001.20 is currently being developed to reflect the changes.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR monitor this pending change request and promulgate guidance if required.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N1 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-10-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-05/4650-99

**SUBJECT:** TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SELRES

**SUBMITTED BY:** PNI Alex Gubanyi  
NAVRESCEN Fort Dix  
(609) 723-7160, ext 114

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The airline ticketing process is cumbersome. SATO in New Orleans requires a minimum of 60 days lead-time to provide tickets to Reservists. The more layers of bureaucracy a process takes, the slower and more expensive the process is and the more likely it is that mistakes will be made. An incredible amount of savings could be realized in manpower, facilities costs and communication costs if the traveler were allowed to make his/her own travel arrangements. The program could be run like the DITY move program for active duty personnel, whereby a computer program, possibly via a web site, is available to compute the maximum allowance ticketing cost between points. If a Reservist spends more than that sum in transportation, he/she pays the difference. If he/she spends less, they are then given some percentage of the savings as an incentive. Like DITY moves of personal property, this could be presented as a member-optional program.

Benefits to the government:

1. Smaller TAR force (both at Reserve activities and at COMNAVRESFOR). As a result:

- a. More fleet manpower
- b. Less active duty pay and benefit costs
- c. Less retirement pay costs

2. Less infrastructure:

- a. Fewer/smaller buildings
- b. Lower utility costs
- c. Lower communications costs

Benefits to the drilling Reservist:

1. More flexibility

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-05/4650-99 (CONTINUED)

2. Direct communication with the airlines
3. Fewer glitches
4. Personal responsibility

**RECOMMENDATION:** Decentralize airline travel arrangements for Naval Reservists, allowing them to make their reservations and execute them.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Michael Goldschmidt  
XO, NAVRESCEN Fort Dix (N01)  
(609) 723-7160, ext. 102

**NAVRESCEN FORT DIX POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** There has to be a better way, but the answer is not necessarily to have drilling Reservists make their own travel arrangements. A problem with individuals making their own arrangements is largely a matter of payment. How will an individual pay for the tickets? There are several possibilities:

1. Some kind of debit card could be used, which would charge an account to a maximum allowed expenditure.
2. Government credit cards could be used, which would allow only a maximum rate per ticket, arranged by the member, but charged directly to a government account.
3. Individuals could make travel arrangements via a government web site, still cutting out the lion's share of bureaucracy.
4. Travel arrangements could be regionalized using local SATO offices in lieu of a single ticket clearing house, as now exists at SATO in New Orleans.

**NAVRESCEN FORT DIX POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Regardless of the fix, 60 days seems an unnecessarily long lead-time required for orders.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LT Christopher J. Gallen  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Four  
(609) 724-7733

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Decentralizing airline travel arrangements is a good idea. The current 60-day lead-time requirement is driven by the fact that 93,000 SELRES have their airline tickets generated by SATO New Orleans.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-05/4650-99 (CONTINUED)

Decentralizing airline travel arrangements to the local SATO office greatly improves flexibility, customer service and timeliness of ticket processing. The faster response time (5 working days) offered by a local SATO office with a smaller workload automatically produces better customer service and the flexibility required to respond to short-fused needs of the fleet.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Due to the potential for problems associated with non-SATO travel, this item is forwarded recommending local SATO sites assume responsibility for SELRES travel.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur.

**COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N3) DISCUSSION (CAPT KEARNEY, 8-4371):** This issue is being reviewed by the COMNAVRESFOR Single Orderwriting PAT.

**Individually Purchased Tickets:** Currently, the JFTR and NAVPTO regulations require that all government travel be booked via a SATO commercial travel office. The regulations do allow for personally purchased tickets, travel Code 7, in the exceptional case when a ticket cannot be purchased by SATO. This authority is closely monitored by NAVPTO Washington, DC and can be rescinded if abused.

**Local SATO Ticketing:** The Single Orderwriting System and Defense Travel Systems will shift orderwriting to the echelon IV/V levels and ticketing will be via the local SATO. It is anticipated that these systems will be fielded in 18-24 months.

**COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N3) RECOMMENDATION:** No requirement to forward this issue to the Policy Board. Recommend that COMNAVRESFOR (N33) provide feedback to the field, updating the status of future changes to the orderwriting and ticketing process.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board concurs that decentralizing the airline ticketing process to the local SATO office will be more responsive to the needs of the Naval Reserve and the Selected Reservist. The Single Orderwriting System Process Action Team (PAT) is reviewing this issue. When fielded, the Single Orderwriting System will facilitate ticketing through the local SATO offices and Echelon IV/V commands.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR brief progress at Mid-Year Review.

ORIGINATOR NUMBER: 04-05/4650-99 (CONTINUED)

COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION: Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N3 provide an update on the implementation of the Single Orderwriting System.

**ITEM:** II-11-99

**COMBINED ORIGINATOR NUMBERS:** 08-11/5230-99 AND 08-24/1430-99

**SUBJECT:** SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE NAVAL RESERVE ADVANCEMENT TRACKING SYSTEM (NAVRATS) AND PRT PROGRAM

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Per COMNAVRESFOR 290830Z Oct 98, requests for software development do not meet the criteria established for policy board consideration. COMNAVRESFORINST 5231.2E establishes procedures for program revisions and improvements.

COMNAVRESFORINST 5231.2E is currently in revision. Recommend the instruction include procedures directing requisition of software development and changes to the proper authority.

Addressing the specific inquiries submitted to the Board, NAVRATS and the PRT program, a temporary replacement for NAVRATS is currently being tested by COMNAVRESFOR (N61).

Additionally, the software development manager for the Navy Standard Integrated Personnel System (NSIPS), which is scheduled for release later this year, will provide advancement tracking information.

Per Chief of Naval Personnel, NPC 601, a replacement program for the current PRT program is also under development and should be fielded in the near future.

Although it was suggested that there should be a delay in discontinuing existing software until automation programs are in place to support such changes, funding and time constraints may delay development of such new programs. Meanwhile, a number of organizations within the Navy and Naval Reserve continue to update automated programs. Even though the idea has merit, it would be difficult and time consuming for one point of contact to gather and administer the various automation initiatives. To prevent duplication of effort members are encouraged to contact the originating organization before developing their own programs.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR update COMNAVRESFORINST 5231.2E to include procedures for submission of automation programs developed by the field.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N6 review this item and take appropriate action.





**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-11/5230-99 (COMBINED WITH 08-24/1430-99)

**SUBJECT:** SOFTWARE SUPPORTING POLICY NOT BEING UPDATED TO  
SUPPORT CHANGES IN POLICY

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Ken Koteles  
NR VTU 0810G  
NAVMARCORESCEN West Palm Beach  
(561) 687-3954

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Various software applications are in use throughout the Navy and Naval Reserve to support our policies. However, as these policies have changed, the software to support those policies has not kept up. As a result, software that is required to support the policy does not do so, provides poor to inadequate information as to compliance with the policy and wastes personnel time by requiring manual manipulation of the data to satisfy the changes in policy. In all policy instances, the policy requires personnel to use the OFFICIAL software even though it may not be up-to-date with supporting policy changes. Specific examples are:

PRT policy and program B Personnel are currently required to use the PRT software to support the PRT program and policies. This software is outdated by several policy changes and bases its calculations on old formulas and data. As a result, personnel must manually manipulate the PRT information to meet current policy requirements. Yet these same personnel are required to use the existing software because it is the only OFFICIAL software recognized by policy.

NAVRATS program B This software program currently lists requirements that are no longer valid or does not reflect those requirements currently identified in the NAVRATS policy.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Require "official use" software be updated when policy is updated or do not release policy changes until updated software can support the policy changes. If the software cannot be updated to support the policy changes, remove the "official use" stamp from the software and the policy requirement to use said software. Until such time as the software is ready to support the policy changes, allow personnel to develop their own that meets the requirements of the policy, and do not penalize units for developing their own software that meets the intent of the policy, if not the letter. Provide a Navy-wide point of contact for software designated as "official use."

**NAVMARCORESCEN WEST PALM BEACH DISCUSSION:** Concur that some software, particularly the current version of the PRT software,

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-11/5230-99 (COMBINED WITH 08-24/1430-99)  
(CONTINUED)

does not support the current PRT policy. It could save a good deal of time and user levels frustration if policies, which are supported by a piece of software, incorporated the software with the distribution of the policy.

**ACTION OFFICER:** ETCM(SW) K. Reese  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Eight

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Tracking information without proper software support is extremely difficult and frustrating. Also, the requirement to maintain like data in separate databases is inefficient both in time management and information sharing.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration. Also, recommend COMNAVRESREDCOMREG Eight devise an interim plan to support those programs which require data tracking, i.e., PRT, NAVRATS and career counseling, as part of the standard database effort.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Creating a standard database for the entire Naval Reserve, incorporating critical data from legacy information systems, would preclude duplicative and many annual reports. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-24/1430-99 (COMBINED WITH 08-11/5230-99)

**SUBJECT:** ADVANCEMENT ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION/WORKSHEET  
PREPARATION

**SUBMITTED BY:** PNC Bremenkamp  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Eight (N1)  
(904) 542-2486; DSN 942-2486

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Advancement requirement verification and worksheet preparation takes too many work hours. NAVRATS (currently used by Naval Reserve activities) will not be functional after the August 1998 advancement cycle. The NAVRATS system will not allow 00 for a year for the Terminal Eligibility Date (TED). The February 1999 E7 cycle will have a 2000JAN01 TED. As of this date, worksheets will have to be prepared manually. (See attached sample of NAVEDTRA 1430/2 Recommendation for Advancement in Rate or Change of Rating (Worksheet)).

**RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend creating a standardized windows database that will allow input of evaluations for performance mark average, courses, PARs, time in rate, printing worksheets and ad hoc reports. This program should be able to calculate advancement statistical data to be used in preparation of advancement reports. Data could be formatted for LAN/WAN for statistical analysis by higher echelons.

**ACTION OFFICER:** ETCM(SW) K. Reese  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Eight  
(904) 542-2486

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The ability to accurately track advancement information is key to this programs success. In an era of reduced manning, automated data tracking systems are essential. The NAVRATS program has inherent problems that require a replacement program in the short term.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration. Also, recommend NAVRESREDCOMREG Eight devise an interim plan to replace the NAVRATS program.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Creating a standard database for the entire Naval Reserve, incorporating critical data from legacy information systems, would preclude duplicative and many annual reports.

**ITEM:** II-12-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-03/5230-99

**SUBJECT:** COMMON WEB PAGE HOSTING

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Douglas W. Swanson  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island Admin Officer  
(360) 257-8429

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The World Wide Web, or web, has presented the Navy/Naval Reserve team with unique opportunities to share information electronically. COMNAVRESFOR policy encourages units to maintain a web presence. However, each Naval Reserve activity is left to their own devices to find suitable hosting for their home pages. Solutions vary from expensive hosting at fee-for-service activities like NCTS, to use of an Internet Service Provider (ISP), to standing up a local server. While each of these alternatives have successfully been employed throughout the Reserve Force, they all come with their unique problems and costs.

In addition, recent CNO/SECNAV policy places limitations on web page content and requires compliance to be reported through echelon II commands. Additional policy guidelines are forthcoming and will likely create additional oversight responsibility for COMNAVRESFOR.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Host a Reserve Force-wide web environment in New Orleans, accessible to each NRA, for postings and maintenance. This solution relieves individual NRAs from the burden and expense of establishing and hosting web environments. Rather they can focus on the content of the web pages, promulgating the best information possible. A single web environment hosted at a central location should be more cost effective and provide greater access capability. At the same time, the Reserve Force can more readily adopt and enforce web policy and standards, giving a common look and feel to the Reserve Force internet presence.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Douglas W. Swanson

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur with discussion above.

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward this item to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**CO, NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Board's recommendation.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-03/5230-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Various elements of the Naval Reserve are instituting their own web sites with little or no coordination, communication, or standardization. Some Readiness Commands (REDCOMs) are already implementing standardized web sites for their centers (i.e., REDCOM EIGHT and FOUR). Recommend efforts at REDCOM EIGHT and FOUR be reviewed for briefing at the Mid-Year Review with the possibility of implementation Force wide.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend this item remain open and its progress be briefed at the Mid-Year Review.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N6 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-13-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-02/5270-99

**SUBJECT:** INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AUGMENT UNITS

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Douglas W. Swanson  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island  
(360) 257-8429

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The Navy team is becoming increasingly dependant on information technology to conduct business. From advertising open jobs to recruiting, to personnel management, technology is permeating every aspect of our Navy lives. As a result, information security and even information warfare will become increasingly important in the Navy=s ability to achieve it=s mission. This phenomenon is not unique to the Navy and the Navy finds itself competing for qualified human resources in a highly competitive environment. As a result, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find and retain personnel with the necessary skills for this new mission area. For technology commands such as SPAWARS and NAVAIRSYSCOM, this has been recognized by creating Reserve units across the country to tap into a highly capable civilian workforce. As the Navy moves to consolidate it=s manpower and personnel systems, a similar acquisition authority has been created, the Systems Executive Office for Manpower Personnel (SEO-MP).

**RECOMMENDATION:** Create Naval Reserve units in labor markets rich in technology skills to augment SEO-MP.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Douglas W. Swanson

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur with the above discussion.

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward this item to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**CO, NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Board=s recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** There is currently a draft Memorandum of Agreement between COMNAVRESFOR (N6), COMNAVRESFOR (N6), and COMNAVAIRESFOR (N6) to establish a Naval Reserve Information Technology (IT) unit(s). Specific issues that have been addressed are unit structuring, availability of billets and resource sponsorship (both Reserve

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-02/5270-99 (CONTINUED)

and active duty). The establishment of such IT units, capitalizing on the civilian talents of SELRES members, would well serve not only the Naval Reserve, but Naval forces in total.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR monitor the progress of the draft MOU between COMNAVRESFOR, COMNAVAIRESFOR and COMNAVSURFRESFOR to ensure optimum unit structure, placement and establishment.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N6 review this item and take appropriate action.



**ITEM:** II-14-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-03/6000-99

**SUBJECT:** ACTIVE DUTY TRAINING (ADT) FUNDING FOR MEDICAL  
UNITS/PERSONNEL

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR J. W. Owen  
NR NAVHOSP JAX 1408  
(803) 502-1116

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Over the last several years, almost all ADT funding for Medical Reserve personnel has been limited to the Association of Military Surgeons of United States (AMSUS) annual conference. There are other AMSUS-sponsored events relating to specific specialty groups within the Department of Medicine and Surgery which should be considered for ADT funding (e.g., the Combined Forces Pharmacy Seminar which is directly related to some NOBCs.)

**RECOMMENDATION:** Make ADT funds available for conferences other than AMSUS.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Jim Carr  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Eight (N3/N7)  
(904) 542-2486

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT BOARD DISCUSSION:** Historically, ADT/Continuing Medical Evaluation (CME) has been used by COMNAVRESFOR to fund all attendees to the AMSUS conference in the first quarter of the fiscal year. Subsequent requests for CME type events are funded out of REDCOM Surface Training Funds (CME registration fees). An individual Reservist's method of travel to valid CME type conferences, seminars, etc., is normally by IDTT if discretionary IDTT is available. In recent years, ADT requests for CME events other than AMSUS have been disapproved by COMNAVSURFRESFOR/COMNAVRESFOR due to lack of ADT. The use of IDTT (IDT drills) to attend CME events considered counter-productive in light of IMSP responsibilities and other special medical programs (same-day surgery) which are dependent upon IDT for execution.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board. Recommend each REDCOM be given a fenced ADT account which, when coupled with CME funds for fees, can be used to fund valid CME events other than AMSUS.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-03/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Chief of Naval Operations (OP931) is the Resource Sponsor for medical funding of CME ADT for its Reserve component. Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, through the Reserve Medical Flag Council, mandates that this ADT funding be used primarily for the annual AMSUS Conference. Any residual CME ADT funding is distributed to COMNAVAIR/SURFRESFOR. This significantly limits Field Commanders from using CME ADT for other CME events.

There are Individual Training Plan (ITP)/mobilization requirements for other CME type training, such as advanced cardiac life support/advanced trauma life support. Use of CME ADT for these other CME events has the potential to enhance healthcare professional retention.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR evaluate ADT CME distribution on a cost benefit basis to help increase Force readiness. However, continue to allocate the primary dollars specifically for the annual AMSUS conference.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N01M review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-15-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-05/6000-99

**SUBJECT:** RESERVISTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO JOIN THE MEDICAL PLAN  
ESTABLISHED FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Paul M. Shaw  
NR NAVAIRPAC 1094  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 423-6456

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** An alluring benefit for Selected Reservists at no cost to the government would be for them to join the medical plan established for military dependents. Military dependents are currently under a medical plan. Selected Reservists should be allowed to join the plan, providing they pay the entire cost of the program. This could allow some of the Selected Reservists to have medical coverage at a better rate than they could obtain as an individual and would allow them to join a plan that would not exclude pre-existing conditions on them or their dependents. A similar program was implemented for Selected Reservists in the option to join the dental plan provided for military dependents. Also, the inclusion of more individuals in the plan could give the Navy more bargaining power with the carrier due to the additional number of participants.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Similar to that provided on the dental plan, Selected Reservists should be allowed to join the medical plan established for military dependents. The Selected Reservists would be required to pay the entire cost of the program.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Paul M. Shaw

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Policy and law regarding Reserve healthcare entitlements is mandated by Congress and the Secretary of Defense in Titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code. Currently, when a Selected Reservist is recalled to active duty for more than 30 days, their family members become eligible for TRICARE benefits. We concur in changing the law to allow Selected Reservists to join the TRICARE plan at their own cost. This would provide more benefits and incentives, while increasing the quality of life for Reservists who do not have access to a civilian medical plan.

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Petition Congress to change the statutory law to allow Selected Reservists to pay for the military TRICARE Medical Plan.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-05/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

**CO, NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the recommendation of the Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The National Defense Authorization Act FY97 Section 746 required a study to identify means to improve the provision of medical and dental care for Reserve component members. A study of health care options for Reservists has been initiated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). Recommendations regarding inclusion of Reservists in TRICARE or Delta Dental have been deferred pending completion of the study.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board recommends allowing TRICARE participation by Selected Reservists as deemed appropriate, and based upon the conclusions of the OSD "746" study.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N01M monitor the OSD study and, if legally possible, take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-16-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 16-05/7000-99

**SUBJECT:** GOVERNMENT RATE AIR TRAVEL

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR John P. Lumetta  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Kansas City  
(816) 923-2341

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Selected Reserve personnel chosen to drill outside their hometown purchase airline tickets in order to attend regularly scheduled drills. These airline tickets are an out-of-pocket expense incurred by the individual in support of official government business.

**RECOMMENDATION:** In order to reduce the out-of-pocket expense to the Selected Reservist, recommend making the government rate for air travel available. While it is widely acknowledged that most air carriers have lower rates available than the Agovernment rate,≐ there are instances when that is not the case and it would give the Selected Reservist an opportunity to reduce their out-of-pocket expense on flights to regularly scheduled drills.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR John P. Lumetta

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIXTEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Reservists who live more than a days drive from their IDT site should be afforded the use of SATO at the government rate.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIXTEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend that all Selected Reservists be able to obtain the government air travel rate.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG SIXTEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forwarded to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The 1999 Defense Budget included a provision authorizing Reservists who travel long distances for weekend drills by commercial airlines to purchase tickets at the government rate. Currently, however, the FY99 General Services Administration (GSA) Airline City Pairs contract does not provide discounted government fares for Reservists without official reimbursable travel orders. The private airline industry is not required to provide discounted rates until the provisions of the law are incorporated into the GSA Airline City Pairs contract. GSA is currently drafting a bilateral contract modification with the airlines to provide

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 16-05/7000-99 (CONTINUED)

Reservists access to government rates. Contract modification is pending DOD development of a mechanism to prevent Reservists from unauthorized airline ticket purchase at government rates. Most likely, the Nations Bank VISA Government Sponsored Travel Charge Card (GTCC) will be the control mandated for Reservists to purchase airline tickets at government rates. All Naval Reservists who need commercial airline tickets to fly to/from drill will be required to have the GTCC issued by their Naval Reserve activity CO. The FY00 GSA Airline City Pairs contract will require airline participation under the new federal law.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR monitor the GSA negotiations and promulgate appropriate policy and enabling instructions. COMNAVRESFOR brief progress at Mid-Year Review.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVRESFOR N3 review this item and take appropriate action.

**ITEM:** II-17-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-06/11000-99

**SUBJECT:** FACILITY MANAGER BILLET AT NAVAL RESERVE ACTIVITIES

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR John D. Croce  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Augusta  
(706)733-2249/0

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Many NRAs do not have a facility manager billet assigned. Facility manager responsibilities are spread among staff members as collateral duties. Some of these collateral duties are significant and require specialized training such as HAZMAT control, safety, maintaining service contracts, energy conservation, pollution prevention plans, etc. Regardless of Reserve center size and drilling populations, the same levels of expertise and time must be devoted to facilities. The same schools and level of expertise in areas of safety, HAZMAT, etc., are required. The consequences of spreading facility responsibilities too thin among various staff members could be significant. Older centers in need of constant upkeep need focused attention on the facility. HAZMAT and environmental issues are significant and can never be neglected.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Assign each Reserve center a facility manager independent of any other staff positions.

**NAVMARCORESCEN AUGUSTA POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Continue to divide facility manager responsibilities among CO, command master chief, storekeeper, medical department representative and training officer. Make use of SELRES expertise. Forward to NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT FY99 Policy Board.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR R. N. Mauldin  
NR MOMAU 6  
NAVRESCEN Charleston  
(843) 743-8620

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur. Assign each Reserve center a facility manager. The Reserve center CO is ultimately responsible for the facility. Make use of SELRES expertise by assigning a hard billet to this position at the local level. Establish a regional facility manager billet to oversee all Reserve centers within each region.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Create an ADSUR billet to consolidate facilities, career counseling and

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-06/11000-99 (CONTINUED)

other collateral duties under one Selected Reservist. In this manner, a reduction in full time support personnel at Reserve centers/readiness commands will not affect these functions.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** There are currently four Civil Engineer Corps (CEC) Officers which coordinate facility and environmental issues for the 10 Naval Reserve Readiness Commands and 158 Reserve Centers. In addition, there is a Selected Reserve CEC Officer at each Readiness Command to assist in facility issues. COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N45) will include this issue for review in IP-2000 planning, which is expected to significantly affect the Naval Reserve's approach to facilities management.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR monitor this issue in relation to the IP-2000 initiative.

**COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. COMNAVSURFRESFOR N5 review this item and take appropriate action.



**CATEGORY III**  
**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD**

<u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>ORIGINATOR NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
III-1	19-06/1000-99	EXTENSION OF TIME AN UNSATISFACTORY DRILLER MUST WAIT BEFORE BEING ALLOWED TO REAFFILIATE WITH THE NAVAL RESERVE FROM 90 TO 180 DAYS
III-2	19-10/1000-99	ORGANIZATION OF THE INTEGRATED CONUS MEDICAL OPERATIONS PLANS (ICMOP) MTF
III-3	SD-06/1000-99	RETENTION OF RESERVE GI BILL BENEFITS AFTER RETIREMENT OR SEPARATION
III-4	FL-08/1001-99	SELECTED RESERVISTS TRAVELING FARTHER THAN 50 MILES BETWEEN THEIR RESIDENCE AND THEIR DRILL SITE SHOULD RECEIVE AN EXTRA DRILL CREDIT (POINTS OR PAY) TO MAKE UP FOR THE TIME SPENT TRAVELING
III-5	PM-07/1001-99 PM-09/1001-99 SD-01/1001-99	RESERVE MANAGEMENT PERIODS (RMPs) AND ADDITIONAL TRAINING PERIODS (ATPs)
III-6	08-29/1020-99	ISSUING COMBAT UTILITY UNIFORMS (CUUs) TO SEABEE PERSONNEL
III-7	11-01/1020-99	SELRES UNIFORM ENTITLEMENTS FOR CPOs AND OFFICERS
III-8	PM-03/1100-99	MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENT FOR RECRUITER CREDIT
III-9	PM-05/1100-99	PERSONNEL NEEDING TO BE 26 YEARS OF AGE TO ENLIST IN THE NAVAL RESERVE WITHOUT PRIOR SERVICE
III-10	PM-06/1100-99	ASSIGNING MEMBERS BY REGIONAL BILLET ASSIGNMENTS
III-11	13-24/1301-99	ASSIGNMENT OF SENIOR OFFICERS TO BILLETS VIA THE APPLY PROGRAM

III-1

<u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>ORIGINATOR NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
III-12	13-10/1418-99	ANNOUNCEMENT OF RATING EXAM TEST RESULTS
III-13	CNCWGT-01/15000-99	ATTENDANCE AT THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING CONTINUUM (LTC)
III-14	04-08/1513-99	ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG)/ ACCELERATED INITIAL ACCESSION (AIA) QUOTA CONTROL PROCESS
III-15	04-03/1521-99	NATIONAL PROSPECTIVE CO/PROSPECTIVE XO COURSE
III-16	19-07/1570-99	SUBMISSION OF INITIAL ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING ORDERS FOR ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG) PERSONNEL IN PROGRAM SEVEN (SEABEE) UNITS
III-17	19-08/1570-99	FLEET ACCESSIONS ARE NOT ALLOWED TO COMPLETE ANNUAL TRAINING (AT) THEIR FIRST YEAR AS A SELRES
III-18	04-06/1571-99	TAKING MEDICAL/DENTAL RECORDS ON ANNUAL TRAINING (AT)
III-19	19-01/1600-99	JURISDICTION OF SELRES DURING INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING (IDT) PERIODS
III-20	06-10/1610-99	PERIODIC EVALUATIONS FOR E6 RESERVISTS
III-21	19-09/1610-99	OFFICER FITNESS REPORTS FOR OICs OF THE INTEGRATED CON-US MEDICAL OPERATIONS PLANS (ICMOP) MTF
III-22	DC-02/1650-99	DOWNGRADED AWARDS
III-23	DC-04/1700-99	COMMISSARY BENEFITS FOR SELRES
III-24	DC-05/1800-99	VESTED RETIREMENT
III-25	04-01/2090-99	WEEKLY OR MONTHLY NAVAL RESERVE NEWSLETTER TO BE DISTRIBUTED BY E-MAIL

<u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>ORIGINATOR NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
III-26	19-03/3500-99	ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN OF THE UNIT TRAINING SCHEDULE (UTS)
III-27	08-10/4000-99	MODIFICATION OF THE 50 MILE BERTHING LIMIT INTO TWO-TIERED MILEAGE CRITERIA
III-28	08-26/4000-99 VA-01/4000-99 WA-07/1700-99	CONTRACT BERTHING
III-29	08-28/4000-99	BACHELOR QUARTERS FOR NON-PAY MEMBERS
III-30	PM-04/4000-99	INITIAL ISSUE OF PHYSICAL TRAINING CLOTHING FOR SELRES
III-31	19-02/5050-99	REQUIRED RESERVE CONFERENCES
III-32	WA-01/5210-99	EXPANSION OF RESERVE UNIT ASSIGNMENT DOCUMENT (RUAD) CAPABILITIES
III-33	DC-07/5234-99 PM-01/5230-99	COMPUTER HARDWARE/SOFTWARE
III-34	PM-08/5230-99	REPROGRAMMING OF AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS (AIS) SOFTWARE
III-35	DC-01/5234-99	RESERVE TRAINING SUPPORT SYSTEM (RTSS) SOFTWARE
III-36	11-02/5300-99	FUNDING OF NAVAL RESERVE BILLETTS AT JOINT UNIFIED COMMANDS
III-37	19-04/5400-99	RESERVE UNIT COLLATERAL DUTY REQUIREMENTS
III-38	DC-06/5400-99	GAINING COMMAND INTEGRATION
III-39	13-17/5420-99	ALLOWING FIRST CLASS PETTY OFFICERS TO SERVE ON THE NATIONAL NAVAL RESERVE POLICY BOARD AND THE COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD
III-40	04-02/5450-99	DESCRIPTION OF NAVAL RESERVE UNITS

<u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>ORIGINATOR NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
III-41	22-02/5510-99	BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS FOR NAVAL RESERVE AFFILIATES
III-42	08-08/6000-99	REINSTITUTION OF THE PARAMEDIC NAVY ENLISTED CLASSIFICATION (NEC)
III-43	13-16/6000-99	MEDICAL CREDENTIAL VERIFICATION PROCESS
III-44	22-01/6000-99	ELIGIBLE SELRES ACCESSING MEDICAL CARE
III-45	CNARF-01/6000-99	TRICARE-SELRES DENTAL PROGRAM BENEFITS FOR VOLUNTARY TRAINING UNIT (VTU) MEMBERS
III-46	FL-01/6000-99	NO DENTAL CARE BENEFITS
III-47	01-09/6120-99	PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS
III-48	WA-05/6230-99	FISCAL SHORTFALLS FOR FUNDING OF MEDICAL SUPPLIES
III-49	04-04/7200-99	HOUSING ALLOWANCE FOR SINGLE RESERVISTS
III-SO	04-10/1320-99	BILLET REQUISITION SYSTEM (BRS)

**ITEM:** III-1-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-06/1000-99

**SUBJECT:** EXTENSION OF TIME AN UNSATISFACTORY DRILLER MUST WAIT  
BEFORE BEING ALLOWED TO REAFFILIATE WITH THE NAVAL  
RESERVE FROM 90 TO 180 DAYS

**SUBMITTED BY:** YNC(AW/SW) Sean Warren  
NAVRESCEN Port Hueneme  
(805) 982-6129; DSN 551-6129

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Ability of unsat Selected Reservists to return to active drilling status after only 90 days contributes significantly to high turnover of Reserve personnel and provides an administrative burden on Reserve center staff. This problem is exacerbated by standard practice of local Reserve recruiters to actively solicit unsat drillers after 90 days, whether or not they have been recommended for reaffiliation. On numerous occasions during the past two years, unsat drillers brought back by recruiters have gone unsat again, forcing the Reserve center to process them for administrative separation to prevent them from returning a third time.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Extending the waiting time from 90 to 180 days would enhance Force stability by making it more difficult for problem Reservists to reaffiliate and lessen their administrative burden on units and FTS staff. It should be emphasized that satisfactory drillers who request transfer to the IRR would remain eligible to rejoin the Selected Reserve after 90 days.

**ACTION OFFICER:** YNC(AW/SW) Sean Warren

**NAVRESCEN PORT HUENEME POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Extending reaffiliation waiting time would force borderline Reservists to take more seriously their responsibility to contact their unit and the Reserve center prior to dropping out of the Naval Reserve. The current revolving door policy of administratively separating unsatisfactory drilling Reservists and then recommending them for reaffiliation is time consuming and detrimental to Reserve readiness.

**NAVRESCEN PORT HUENEME POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward for consideration by the NAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen Policy Board.

**CO, NAVRESCEN PORT HUENEME RECOMMENDATION:** Forward for consideration by the NAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen Policy Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-06/1000-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Policy Board agreed with this recommendation. There does seem to be some indication that this avenue is used by some Reservists to move out of less desirable units into more desirable ones.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is recommended.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Adjudication authority for approval or disapproval of an unsatisfactory drill waiver must be endorsed by the Commanding Officer of the Naval Reserve Activity (NRA) at which the applicant drills. The waiver is then forwarded, via Commander, Naval Reserve Recruiting Command, to the respective N1 code of Commander, Naval Surface Reserve Force or Commander, Naval Air Reserve Force, who are the cognizant adjudication authorities. If approved and the applicant has been out of a drill pay status exceeding 90 days, the member can then be gained into a drill pay status.

NRAs have an active role in determining when and if a member returns to drill status. The return of Reservists to drilling status from the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) after the 90 day period, is best controlled at the NRA level.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-2-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-10/1000-99

**SUBJECT:** ORGANIZATION OF THE INTEGRATED CONUS MEDICAL OPERATIONS PLANS (ICMOP) MTF

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR L. E. Dove  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach  
(310) 732-5742

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** COMNAVSURFRESFOR New Orleans LA 081308Z Oct 97 provided guidance for the organization of the Integrated CONUS Medical Operations Plans (ICMOP) MTFs. However, as currently structured, the guidance conflicts with other instructions and is not the most efficient way to be organized for the following reasons:

1. Unit COs records and drill accounting maintained by the Naval Reserve activity (NRA) closest to the member=s home and the CO is assigned to the REDCOM in which the Naval hospital is located and the REDCOM provides all IDTT orders. This complicates maintenance of records, especially with the way COs are now selected through national selection boards. NRAs end up with conflicting requirements of who is supposed to do what.

2. Reporting senior for all OICs of assigned hospital units will be the Unit CO. Per BUPERSINST 1610.10, the unit CO is not authorized to be a reporting senior by the fact that although identified in the COMNAVSURFRESFOR message as CO, they are not COs of a unit since they are assigned to the REDCOM.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Establish a headquarters unit, like other communities have, and place this unit at the NRA closest to the gaining command. The CO can then be the reporting senior and will be authorized to write FITREPS for all OICs. Personnel who want to flex drill will also be assigned to the REDCOM.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR L. E. Dove

**NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The ICMOP MTFs appear to be set up and governed in a confusing way, resulting in conflicting requirements and unauthorized responsibility. The players involved are the following:

- Unit CO (this person is on the REDCOM staff, so is not technically a CO, but physically drills at the medical treatment facility, the gaining command)
- REDCOM (provide IDTT orders for unit CO)
- NRA nearest the COs home (maintain unit COs records)

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-10/1000-99 (CONTINUED)

- NRA for hospital unit OICs (have concurrent signature authority on hospital unit OICs with the unit CO)
- Unit OIC (drills at one location with a NRA, gaining command is at another location - medical treatment facility; unit CO is a member of REDCOM staff, not the gaining command)
- Unit personnel, doctors, nurses and corpsmen (records maintained by NRA closest to unit=s drilling location, however, member may physically drill at the gaining command under the guidance of the unit CO)
- Technically, a REDCOM staff member is not officially a unit CO unless they are set up as a headquarters unit with their own UIC. They do not have any authority to sign FITREPS on the unit OICs - the unit OICs should currently be receiving FITREPS signed concurrently by the CO, NRA and the CO of the MTF that they support. If a headquarters unit were established, the headquarters unit CO would then have the authority to sign as reporting senior for the unit OICs, with a concurrent FITREP or input from the MTF they support. Also, any unit individuals who regularly drill in the same location as the unit CO (not the unit OIC) would be assigned to this headquarters unit, and their records would be maintained at the NRA closest to the command they are supporting. Accountability for the individual and his/her records would be made much easier.

**NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur.  
Forward to the NAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen Policy Board.

**CO, NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Headquarters Reserve UIC is being established at designated NRAs effective 1 January 1999 as a billet holding RUIC to provide billet visibility to unit COs. The unit COs have agreed to this organization at the national conference. We recommend that this change be permitted as a trial period to determine whether the organizational structure solves administrative issues at the NRAs.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** CO billets need to be moved from the REDCOM staff unit to the respective headquarters unit. This will allow the CO to officially be the reporting senior and therefore authorized signature authority for OIC FITREPs. Assign maintenance of personnel records and all administrative functions (i.e., drill accounting, IDTT orders, etc.) to the NRA holding the headquarters RUIC.



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-10/1000-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Responsive action has been initiated prior to the submission of this issue. COMNAVSURFRESFOR 181300Z Sep 98 directs and promulgates guidance for the reorganization and centralization of Program 32 billets. The reorganization establishes headquarters detachments at affected Naval Reserve Readiness Commands and allows Reporting Senior authorization for Officer-In-Charge Fitness Reports.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-3-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-06/1000-99

**SUBJECT:** RETENTION OF RESERVE GI BILL BENEFITS AFTER RETIREMENT  
OR SEPARATION

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Paul M. Shaw  
NR NAVAIRPAC 1094  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 423-6456

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Reservists who obligate for six years to receive the Reserve GI Bill (Chapter 1606) and serve those six years lose their educational benefit upon separation or retirement. Active duty personnel receive a transition of 10 years to use their Montgomery GI Bill benefits after they separate or retire.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Reservists who obligate for six years to receive their GI Bill benefits should receive a specified transition time and contribute a monetary amount similar to active duty personnel.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Paul M. Shaw

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Currently, Selected Reservists must incur a six-year obligation in a drill pay status (VTU not allowed) before they can use their Reserve GI Bill (Chapter 1606). Selected Reserve GI Bill eligibility requirements are:

1. Sign a six-year obligation in the Selected Reserve (VTU members are not in the Selected Reserve). Officers sign a Page 13 entry stating they will be in a drill pay status for the next six years in order to receive the GI Bill.
2. Possess a high school diploma or equivalent prior to completion of Initial Active Duty for Training (IADT).
3. Complete any required IADT.
4. Not be in receipt of a Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) scholarship stipend.

Under the Montgomery GI Bill, Chapter 20, active duty members must contribute \$100 a month for 12 months to receive their 10 years transition period upon release from active duty. Under the Reserve GI Bill, Reservists do not contribute money, but instead incur a six-year obligation.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-06/1000-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Change existing legislation allowing Selected Reservists to contribute a specified amount for an assigned time frame and set a transition period allowing them to use their GI Bill benefits after leaving the Navy.

**CO, NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the recommendation of the Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The 1998 Board classified this item as a Category I and forwarded it to the 1998 National Naval Reserve Policy Board (NNRPB). Upon their review, it was determined that the Montgomery GI Bill-Selected Reserve (MGIB-SR) is authorized by separate legislation from its active duty counterpart. MGIB active duty personnel are required to pay into the program, while Reserve personnel are required to obligate six years of Reserve service without payment into the program.

This issue was referred to the NNRPB in a prior year and the item was closed.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-4-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** FL-08/1001-99

**SUBJECT:** SELECTED RESERVISTS TRAVELING FARTHER THAN 50 MILES  
BETWEEN THEIR RESIDENCE AND THEIR DRILL SITE SHOULD  
RECEIVE AN EXTRA DRILL CREDIT (POINTS OR PAY) TO MAKE  
UP FOR THE TIME SPENT TRAVELING

**SUBMITTED BY:** AOC Paul Luck  
VTU-7474  
NAVAIRES Jacksonville  
DSN 942-3320, ext 130

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Selected Reservists who do not live in the  
local area (within 50 mile radius of their drill site) receive no  
compensation (points or pay) for the time they spend commuting to  
their drill site.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Either pay members one extra drill or allow them  
to accumulate retirement points equal to one drill each time they  
commute more than 50 miles.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Warren  
NAVAIRES Jacksonville  
DSN 942-3320, ext 130

**NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFORINST  
1001.5C, Section 103, states that obligors requesting assignment  
outside a reasonable commuting distance must sign a NAVPERS  
1070/613 (page 13) entry acknowledging that they will not receive  
pay for travel expenses to or from their IDT site. Section 402  
defines Reasonable commuting distance as Any distance within  
a 50 mile radius of the IDT site, but not exceeding that which  
can be traveled by automobile under average traffic conditions  
within a period of 1 2 hours.

**NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** A  
COMNAVRESFOR Force-wide policy change would dictate several  
changes to the governing instruction. To pay for an additional  
drill each month for personnel traveling over 50 miles would  
potentially be cost prohibitive. Recommend allowing personnel  
who reside farther than 50 miles from their IDT site to  
accumulate an additional 12 unpaid IDT points per fiscal year.

**CO, NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to  
the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** FL-08/1001-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The effort that individuals make in attending scheduled drills is recognized, however, there are limitations to the types of duties for which the Naval Reserve can provide compensation. Per DODINST 1215.19, travel does not fall within the scope of authorized activities under any drill status category regardless of whether the drill is paid or unpaid. Drills are authorized for direct contributory support or training purposes only. At present, there is a funding shortfall of over 50 percent for additional drills needed to support mission requirements.

Under these circumstances providing additional drill funding for travel is not warranted.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-5-99

**COMBINED ORIGINATOR NUMBERS:** PM-07/1001-99, PM-09/1001-99, AND  
SD-01/1001-99

**SUBJECT:** RESERVE MANAGEMENT PERIODS (RMPs) AND ADDITIONAL  
TRAINING PERIODS (ATPs)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The extra effort and time many Selected Reservists devote to their units are greatly appreciated. For consideration and approval of ATPs and RMPs, requests should be submitted to COMNAVAIRESFOR or COMNAVSURFRESFOR through the unit's chain of command. COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5C and DODINST 1215.19 apply. This issue was previously addressed as Item III-41 by the 1997 COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:**  
Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-07/1001-99 (COMBINED WITH PM-09/1001-99  
AND SD-01/1001-99)

**SUBJECT:** AUTHORIZE RESERVE MANAGEMENT PERIODS FOR NR CV/CVN  
AUGMENT UNITS

**SUBMITTED BY:** LT K. C. Guth  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Key officers in large NR CV/CVN augment units are unable to complete their management duties during drill weekends. Officer end strength does not allow for additional officers. Key officers (COs, XOs, TOs and AOs) need more time to prepare for drill weekends, to interface with the NAVAIRES Point Mugu staff outside of drill weekends and interface with their unit's junior personnel during the busy drill weekends. Ultimately, retention, morale and costs are negatively affected.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Authorize Reserve Management Periods (RMPs) for Naval Reserve CV/CVN augment units. Billets designated by the echelon IV NAVAIRES CO should be modified with an Expanded Compensation Pay Code (ECPC) of AF $\cong$  (48 pay IDT periods + 12 additional pay IDT periods).

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, strongly recommending approval. Given the size of the Atypical $\cong$  CV/CVN augment unit and the newly instituted procedures for demand-driven CV augmentation, the workload attendant to our CV augment CO positions creates a real need for such RMP drills.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-09/1001-99 (COMBINED WITH PM-07/1001-99  
AND SD-01/1001-99)

**SUBJECT:** ADDITIONAL DRILLS FOR PAY

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Waddell  
Force Protection LEPSU 0176  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Currently, Selected Reservists affiliated with Force Protection Law Enforcement and Physical Security Units (FP LEPSU), are not eligible to receive additional drills with pay. All LEPSU personnel are being tasked with increasing and varied operational commitments that might require them to reschedule from their designated drill weekends. This can lead to personnel not receiving required training that is only available on drill weekends.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Establish a limited number of paid additional drills available to FP LEPSU members so they can meet the increasing requests for contributory support in the area of Force Protection. Also, with paid additional drills, LEPSU members would not have to reschedule from drill weekends. This would increase the unit=s training and readiness levels.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, recommending approval. The criticality of the Force Protection mission is driving a great number of requests for support from our LEPS units. Paid additional drills would be an effective means of enhancing our capability to provide this support.





**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-01/1001-99 (COMBINED WITH PM-07/1001-99  
AND PM-09/1001-99)

**SUBJECT:** ADDITIONAL DRILLS FOR AUGMENT UNIT COMMANDING OFFICERS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Donald L. Roy  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 545-2645; DSN 735-2645

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** In July 1996, the Naval Postgraduate School published a report entitled *AEffective Leadership in TPUs: Findings from Interviews with 16 Units.*≡ This report was a study of effective leadership in company-level units in the U.S. Army Reserve, equivalent to Naval Reserve augment units. In Section IV of the report, the authors stated:

*AThe most apparent finding involved the sheer amount of time and energy required to be an effective unit commander. Commanders in our sample reported widely different amounts of time spent on unit business - from a low of four hours per week to a high of 22 hours (the mean number of hours per week was 11.7). These figures are based on non-drill weeks and understate the actual workload on the commanders, since they do not include drill hours, the two weeks of Annual Training or time away for schooling.*≡

Our experience at NAVAIRES San Diego substantiates the results of this study. The demands which we place on unit commanding officers to lead their units, in addition to the demands of the gaining command, make it impossible for the commanding officer to fulfill his/her responsibilities within the amount of time for which they actually get paid. Authorizing them one additional drill per month would help alleviate some of the burden. This would still not cover the outside work they actually do, but would provide some recognition, reward and incentive for executing the responsibilities of an augment unit commanding officer.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Authorize 12 additional drills annually for augment unit commanding officers.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Donald L. Roy

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** We concur that the administrative workload is difficult for unit commanding officers to complete on a drill weekend and all unit commanding officers give extra personal time to effectively manage the unit. This request would help maintain unit readiness at higher levels and

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** SD-01/1001-99 (COMBINED WITH PM-07/1001-99  
AND PM-09/1001-99)

reward unit commanding officers for their efforts, but is subject to RPN budget constraints.

**NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR review authorizing 12 additional drills annually for augment unit commanding officers if RPN funding permits.

**CO, NAVAIRES SAN DIEGO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the recommendation of the Board. We demand a great deal from our augment unit commanding officers. It is an established fact that they spend a great deal of time outside of drill weekend on unit business. We should compensate them for at least a portion of the time these dedicated officers spend working for their units.

**ITEM:** III-6-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-29/1020-99

**SUBJECT:** ISSUING COMBAT UTILITY UNIFORM (CUU)

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR T. P. Newdome  
NR NMCB-14  
NAVMARCORESCEN Jacksonville  
(904) 542-1700

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Each enlisted Reservist assigned to a Naval Reserve activity is issued a standard clothing allowance, regardless of occupational field. Naval Construction Force (NCF) (SEABEE) personnel rarely wear the dungaree issue and are not required to wear them after the member receives the CUU. CUUs are issued to the NCF Reservist out of the unit OPTAR. An initial Reserve center issue of CUUs, vice dungarees, would be more convenient and would save money throughout the Naval Reserve.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Review and revise the policy for NRAs to issue CUUs vice dungarees in an amount equal to the cost of the current dungaree issue, for those Reservists newly assigned to NCF units.

**NAVMARCORESCEN JACKSONVILLE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**  
COMNAVRESFORINST P4000.1, chapter 4, outlines that Naval Reserve units may be issued CUUs. Prior to 1992, Reserve activities did issue CUUs to the NCF population. The only problem we foresee is that CUUs are procured with O&MNR funds and the dungaree issue is procured with RPN funds. There would have to be a redesignation of CUUs as non-organizational clothing. Recommend redesignate CUUs as non-organizational clothing. Let Reserve activities issue CUUS to NCF-bound enlisted Reservists instead of dungarees.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR R. N. Mauldin  
NR MOMAU 6  
NAVRESCEN Charleston  
(843) 743-8620

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur. Review and revise current policy to redesignate the issuance of CUUs vice dungarees for NCF units. It is recommended that CUUs for NCF units be designated as organizational clothing in lieu of dungarees. An initial issue of CUUs will be more cost effective for the Naval Reserve.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-29/1020-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Standard Navy uniform seabags include dungarees per the Uniform Regulations, NAVPERS 15665I. Individuals attached to a unit wearing the CUU are required to maintain a full seabag. CUU units have administrative personnel assigned, who could transfer to a non-CUU unit, therefore requiring the dungaree uniform. Also, there are times when the dungaree uniform is prescribed (i.e, induction to Naval Correctional Custody Units). This is a Total Force issue and members of the Naval Reserve Force must comply with Uniform Regulations.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-7-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 11-01/1020-99

**SUBJECT:** SELECTED RESERVE UNIFORM ENTITLEMENTS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR David W. Birt  
NAVRESCEN Corpus Christi  
DSN 861-2243

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The uniform entitlement for a Selected Reservist advanced to Chief Petty Officer (CPO) or newly commissioned officer in the Naval Reserve is insufficient in amount, not payable to the individual in a timely manner and is not consistent between the two types of career advancement.

Per the DOD Pay Manual, 30602 and 80332, Naval Reserve officers initially commissioned or transferred from another branch of the Armed Forces, are entitled to an initial allowance of \$200 for both male and female. This amount minimally covers the cost of one complete uniform.

At the same time, the entitlement for an individual advanced to CPO is approximately \$400 for males and \$500 for females.

In both cases, the amount should be reviewed and in the case of newly commissioned officers raised, at least, to the amount allowed for new CPOs.

For newly commissioned officers, the entitlement is not payable until after the member completes 14 IDTs, 14 days AT or 90 days of active duty. Therefore, the member must pay up front the significant uniform costs for commissioning.

In the case of newly advanced CPOs, payment is not made until the member is actually promoted, which could be up to a year after the September frocking.

**RECOMMENDATION:** COMNAVRESFOR support reviewing the uniform entitlements with an aim of standardizing the entitlements, increasing the entitlements and making them payable upon acceptance for commissioning or selection for advancement to CPO.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ELEVEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Initial uniform entitlement for newly commissioned officers should be paid upon their effective date of rank, vice making them wait four to six months. Also, newly commissioned officer incur higher initial uniform costs than newly selected CPOs and, therefore, should receive an equitable initial uniform allowance.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 11-01/1020-99 (CONTINUED)

Most newly selected CPOs are frocked at the same time in September. Payment of the initial uniform allowance at this time would fall in an earlier fiscal year than their advancement authorization, would be cost prohibitive and a burden on the financial system coming at the end of a fiscal year. Since the Navy uniform exchange system will defer payment on their new uniforms until their date of rank, there should not be an undue financial burden on the individual at the time of frocking.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ELEVEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the recommendations for paying newly commissioned officers their initial uniform allowance effective upon their date of rank. The Board does not concur with paying an allowance to CPOs at frocking. Recommend forwarding to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG ELEVEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Newly selected CPOs are not entitled to any pay and allowances until advanced to that paygrade. The Navy does not have the authority to pay these members in advance. The Board does not concur with paying an allowance to CPOs at frocking.

Title 37, US Code, provides that all officers in the Uniform Services are paid an initial uniform allowance of \$200. It is the consensus of the Board that the Chief of Naval Operations (PERS20) is responsible for adjusting this allowance. Submission of this item is not within the scope of this Board. In addition, under current law, Reservist officers are compensated exactly as their active duty counterparts.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-8-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-03/1100-99

**SUBJECT:** MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENT FOR RECRUITER CREDIT

**SUBMITTED BY:** PN2 Roberts  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Currently, the new Selected Reservist gain must complete only a four-hour drill period in order for the recruiter to receive credit for the quota. After the four-hour period is complete, if the member is not obligated to drill (AIA or APG), he/she can put in a request to be transferred to the IRR with a recommendation for reaffiliation. This wastes work hours for PSD, medical and NAVAIRES Point Mugu, because it takes approximately two days to completely process a gain. After the member requests transfer to the IRR, it takes approximately two days to process the loss (by PSD, medical and NAVAIRES Point Mugu). The Reserve unit must complete a transfer evaluation on the member they have never seen. The member fills a billet that could have been used for a Selected Reservist who really wants to make a long-term commitment.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Require all new gains to drill eight drill periods (two months) before the recruiter receives credit for the new affiliate.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, strongly recommending approval.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The current policy on credit for the Recruiter is to authorize credit before the new member's first drill. If the applicant does not report for the arranged drill, the gain is subtracted from the Recruiter's statistics. The consensus of the Board is to keep the present policy of Recruiter credit in place and to emphasize the importance of a quality turnover of new accessions to the Naval Reserve Activity.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.



**ITEM:** III-9-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-05/1100-99

**SUBJECT:** PERSONNEL NEEDING TO BE 26 YEARS OF AGE TO ENLIST IN  
THE NAVAL RESERVE WITHOUT PRIOR SERVICE

**SUBMITTED BY:** HM1 Sands  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Currently, a person must be a minimum of 26 years of age to enlist in the Naval Reserve if he/she has no prior service.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Exceptions should be made for individuals with degrees, professional licenses or certificates that make that person qualified for a Navy NEC.

Well qualified individuals who would be beneficial to the Navy are being turned away because of their age. The Navy would benefit from a person who would attend civilian school on his/her own initiative and become licensed as a professional in the civilian population. Paramedics, x-ray technicians, respiratory technicians and many other technicians are difficult billets to fill due to the lack of funding for training. However, there are licensed civilian counterparts, who are already trained in these technical fields who are being turned away.

Most technicians are receiving their licenses before the age of 26. For many, they are a licensed professional by the age of 20. This can be 6 years of lost service to the Navy. For many, if a person does not enlist at a young age, he/she is unlikely to enlist when they are older. This would be an entire loss to the Navy of this person=s skills.

In the law enforcement field, we have individuals who attend a 7-month academy and then another year of job training before they receive the P.O.S.T. certificate. The local government hand-picked these individuals through a series of background checks and interviews. They are considered the city=s cream of the crop, the city=s leaders, trusted to make life and death decisions under stressful conditions, yet they are not qualified to serve their country in the Naval Reserve because they are under the age of 26.

The Naval Reserve will continue to lose the opportunity to recruit needed skilled people because of this minimum age requirement. To remedy this, the Naval Reserve should make

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-05/1100-99 (CONTINUED)

recruitment exceptions to skilled exceptional people.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, strongly recommending approval. Notwithstanding considerations of individual maturity, the Naval Reserve is bypassing potentially hundreds of man-years of skilled service under the current policy.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Guidelines for enlistment of non-prior service members in the Naval Reserve are contained in COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5C, paragraph 110. The stipulation that non-prior service enlistees be 26 years old is designed to prevent competition with regular Navy recruiting for the same individuals. Although it is true that Naval Reserve recruiting is limited by the minimum age restriction, it is the consensus of the Board that this recruiting restriction is in the best interest of the Total Force.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-10-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-06/1100-99

**SUBJECT:** REGIONAL BILLET ASSIGNMENTS

**SUBMITTED BY:** PNC Ternahan  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The Naval Reserve recruits to national billet vacancies/reservations. The vacant rate often does not exist at the local unit. Recruiting in some areas continues despite the resulting excessive in-assignment processing (IAP) rates. Sometimes billets cannot be found for cross assignment purposes on the national list. If a billet is found, cross assigning out causes a training management problem. Furthermore, travel to the gaining command is often not practical.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Substitute regional vacancies for national vacancies and require recruiters to fill specific regional reservations. Exception could be allowed for critical NOBCs and NECs, as in Program 32 (Medical) units.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forwarded for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Recruitment and assignment of Naval Reservists to a local or regional billet is the ideal situation. The mobility of our Naval Reservists, however, often causes local billet fills to be changed to IAPs or cross assignments due to the relocation of the Selected Reservist. In spite of these training and management issues, the National Assignment System, as currently configured, allows the Naval Reserve to more adequately meet Total Force manpower requirements.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-11-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 13-24/1301-99

**SUBJECT:** ASSIGNMENT OF SENIOR OFFICERS TO BILLETS VIA THE APPLY PROGRAM

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT B. R. Lance  
NR NAVHOSP Great Lakes 1713  
NAVRESCEN Youngstown  
(H) (330) 678-0757; (W) 330-376-1325

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The National, Command and Senior Officer Non-Command Billet Screening and Detailing Board was established to Aissue fair, efficient and standardization procedures to fill billets for the Naval Surface Reserve Force. Since its establishment, several issues of implementation have surfaced which are in conflict.

A specific issue is that Echelon IV commanders are allowed to have local selection boards to fill billets and jobs. Echelon IV commanders must inform COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N12) of their intent to fill billets locally. However, in fairness to the Reservists, once the positions are advertised, the national board should take precedence. The Echelon IV commanders have had their opportunity to notify N12 of their intent to fill the positions. Once their Aindow of opportunity has passed, the process should go forward. If it is advertised as being available, it should be filled by the national board.

**Example:** I was selected for the DNS position in Fleet Hospital 21. Two months later I was informed that the billet had been filled locally and was not available.

**RECOMMENDATION:** If the board is truly intended to Aissue fair, efficient, and standardization procedures to fill billets, the process needs to be reevaluated. Jobs and mobilization billets need to be separated, clearly identified and advertised truthfully.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CAPT B. R. Lance  
NR NAVHOSP Great Lakes 1713

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded for consideration. It is recommended that once a billet has been advertised at the National Command, Non-Command Billet Screening and Detailing Board the billet can no longer to be filled by Echelon IV commanders.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** A procedural flaw resulted in two personnel being selected for the same billet. The time line for Echelon IV notification of local fills has been adjusted to prevent a recurrence.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-12-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER** 13-10/1418-99

**SUBJECT:** EXAM TEST RESULTS

**SUBMITTED BY:** OSCM(SW) George P. Allen  
NAVRESCEN Rock Island  
(309) 782-0960

**PROBLEM:** The time frame between taking the petty officer exam and receiving the results appears excessive.

**DISCUSSION:** Many factors add time to the process between taking the test and learning the results. Most of those events are accelerated to a point where further time conservation may not yield a perceivable improvement in the chain of events. Currently, SELRES results are reported out at nearly the same time as the TAR results. This means, for example, a SELRES member taking an exam in August and a TAR taking the test in September will get the results at nearly the same time.

**RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended that tests are given during the same month for SELRES and TAR or results are reported out sooner. Either way, the objective is to get the results back prior to one month before the next exam cycle. All efforts to expedite the process are encouraged. An investigative body to look into the process is suggested with an emphasis on electronic means to improve the process.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR James Stevens  
NR NH GLAKES DET S  
(H) (630) 420-0846; (W) (815) 782-6084

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Current information technology supports a turnaround time of 30 days or less from the last day the exam can be administered to active or Reserve members. The current two-month delay in obtaining the results of advancement exams negatively impacts the morale of our sailors and impedes their ability to prepare for the subsequent examination.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** A change to the advancement exam schedule is not recommended. Scheduling Selected Reserve advancement exams one month prior to active duty exams permits answer sheets to be received by the Naval Education and Training Professional Development and Technology Center approximately the same time as active duty. Forwarded for consideration.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER** 13-10/1418-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Fixed factors such as the determination of advancement quotas and the active duty exam schedule drive the date that exam results are issued. USNR(TAR) advancement exams are held to coincide with USN active duty exams as a matter of practicality in scheduling exams within an active duty command. SELRES exams precede USN and USNR(TAR) exams in order to accommodate SELRES who drill on various weekends. The following month (which coincides with the active duty exam cycle) provides time for justified make-up exams. Conducting SELRES and TAR exams during the same month would, in effect, either eliminate the make-up exam opportunity for SELRES or significantly complicate the administration of advancement exams within an active duty command.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-13-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** CNCWGT-01/1500-99

**SUBJECT:** LEADERSHIP TRAINING CONTINUUM (LTC)

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Michael R. Ewing  
MIUWU 210  
(410) 539-2481

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** COMNAVSURFRESFOR has directed officers in commissioned units to attend LTC courses. The course assignment is based upon billet; Commanding Officers (COs) attend the command course, Executive Officers (XOs) the advanced course and Department Heads attend the intermediate course. In theory, this assignment by billet appears correct, practicality it does not. This is a result of Reserve officers not having the exact career path as active duty officers. Two examples apply:

1. Our Maintenance and Repair Department Head attended the intermediate course. Although he felt this was a valuable course, he was the most senior officer in the class. He is a senior Lieutenant Commander (LCDR) who is awaiting the results of the Commander (CDR) Board. If he were on active duty, he would not be at the department head point of his career and would not have attended the intermediate course.

2. I went from Division Officer tours on active duty to Division Officer tours in the Reserve. Followed by CO of a ship augment unit, Officer-In-Charge (OIC) of an inshore boat unit and then the XO of a MIUWU. I have yet to do a department head job. Would I then, as a CDR, require the intermediate course?

**RECOMMENDATION:** Change the policy to one or both of the following:

1. Allow the CO of commissioned units (or the next higher echelon) to waive the LTC requirement when the requirement does not pass the Acommon sense test.≡ (Current policy requires the first flag officer in the chain of command to waive the requirement.)

2. Allow the officer to attend the LTC that is more suited to his/her career point, not tying it to his/her billet.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Timothy D. Moon  
(757) 887-7457; DSN 953-7457

**NIUWGRU TWO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The policy requiring all COs, XOs, department heads and division officers in commissioned

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** CNCWGT-01/1500-99 (CONTINUED)

Reserve units to attend LTC within one year of billet assignment is not realistically achievable due to a combination of operational requirements, inadequate funding resources and availability of Selected Reserve (SELRES) personnel to complete more than 12 days of Annual Training (AT) per year. The current requirement for all of these officers to attend the various levels of LTC is cumbersome and may have a significant impact on the officer resources available to complete the unit=s operational commitments.

The Division Officer, Department Head, advanced and command level LTC courses have readily apparent benefits in the developments and maintenance of the leadership skills of the Naval Reserve Officer Corps. However, due to operational commitments and limitations in time and funding resources, the current requirement for all officers assigned to Division Officer, Department Head, XO and CO is burdensome and is likely to adversely impact the operational readiness of commissioned units that it is designed to benefit.

Commissioned units in COMNAVSURFRESFOR are manned by a mix of SELRES and TAR personnel. In most cases, all officer personnel assigned to a commissioned unit are SELRES who are funded to complete a 12-day AT period, as well as perform 48 IDT periods each year. Obtaining required watch station qualifications, maintaining operational skills, completing training requirements (i.e., CMS school, Joint Maritime Command Information Systems (JMCIS) Watch Officer school, MIUW System Upgrade Fleet Indoctrination Training, etc.) and support fleet-sponsored exercises or operations must be achieved during either the Inactive Duty Training (IDT) or AT periods. With most commissioned units scheduled to participate in OUTCONUS operations every year, the requirement for all assigned officers to attend LTC is considered burdensome and not readily achievable because they are needed for these operations.

The following are additional discussion points:

1. Division Officer billets in commissioned units are normally filled by Lieutenants (LTs) or LCDRs who have completed at least one shipboard division officer tour.
2. Department Head billets in commissioned units are normally filled by senior LCDRs who have completed a shipboard division officer tour and have held several responsible positions in the Naval Reserve.



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** CNCWGT-01/1500-99 (CONTINUED)

3. COs and XOs are both assigned to their billets for a period of two years. It is unrealistic to assume that they both can be absent from a fleet-sponsored operation or exercise.

4. Attendance at LTC outside of the normal AT period will require allocation of additional funds, as well as increasing the AT requirement for SELRES officers from 12 to 24 days, which will potentially impact their civilian employment.

**NIUWGRU TWO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend that the requirement for all COs, XOs, Department Heads and Division Officers in commissioned units attend LTC within one year of billet assignment be studied and modified to account for the unique constraints of Reserve participation, funding and operational commitments.

**COMNIUWGRU TWO RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Echelon IV commanders should identify the key billets within their subordinate Reserve commissioned units that shall be required to attend the appropriate two-week LTC course. Also, echelon IV commanders should be granted the authority to waive the requirements on a case-by-case basis, based on operational requirements.

2. Remove the LTC requirement for SELRES officers assigned to division officer billets in commissioned units. LTs or LCDRs who have completed at least one shipboard division officer tour normally fill these billets.

3. The determination of which two-week course is appropriate for each billet (or individual) should account for that billet=s (or individual=s) rank and responsibility. (For a CDR assigned to a department head billet, the appropriate LTC is either the advanced or command level course.)

4. Those billets (officers) not identified as requiring completion of the two-week LTC shall be required to attend the COMNAVRESFOR-sponsored two-day leadership course, which can be accomplished during a normal IDT period.

5. Provide additional funding in the form of AT (Special) for all SELRES officers required to attend LTC to complete the course and still support unit operational commitments. If the requirement for all COs, XOs, department heads and division officers to attend LTC is not modified, this will require fully

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** CNCWGT-01/1500-99 (CONTINUED)

funding an additional 12 days of AT (Special) for all officers assigned to these billets.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR fully supports the CNO's guidance for mandatory LTC for all active duty and SELRES. The LTC is one of the vehicles selected by CNO to ensure mission readiness and leadership qualities throughout the chain of command. Non-attendance due to unit operational commitments or other exceptions jeopardizes the CNO's vision for Total Force Leadership training, as well as the potential for promotion or advancement of the individual service member. NAVADMIN 189/97 and ALNAVRESFOR 18/97 provides for the appropriate LTC at career milestones and/or equivalent years of service. Active participation and support of the LTC is essential to the long-term success of the Naval Reserve and contributes directly to the Total Force concept.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-14-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-08/1513-99

**SUBJECT:** ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG)/ACCELERATED INITIAL ACCESSION  
(AIA) QUOTA CONTROL PROCESS

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR J. P. Steinbronn  
CO, NAVRESCEN Avoca  
(717) 457-8430

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The present means of obtaining AT orders for APG school at the Professional Development Center in New Orleans is inadequate to ensure that the backlog of APG/AIA accessions are provided with the opportunity to attend the required course prior to their 36-month time limit. The associated retention problem is also significant, in that their TIR counter for advancement eligibility for their next higher pay grade does not start until their temporary rate is made permanent (APG school is one of the requirements). Therefore, due to no fault of the member, they remain ineligible for advancement exams with the sole requirement being the APG school.

In particular dire straights are the construction battalion personnel, as they have been struggling with the new Order Writing Module (OM) at the battalion RSS sites due to shutdown of COMRNCFS AT order writing out of Gulfport, MS on 1 October 1997. Although they have made giant leaps in the advance notice of AT orders, they did not get "front of the line privileges" with respect to getting their fair share of APG schools for personnel accessed prior to 1 October 1997.

Presently, FY98 APG school quotas for all classes are filled, but "no shows" continue to occur and cannot be filled after each class starts. Due to the huge backlog of quota requests, the recruiting command has suspended the APG/AIA recruitment programs which in turn will have significant end strength impact starting in May 1998. This is a serious two-edged problem of retention and accession facing the manpower side of the house.

**RECOMMENDATION:** There are at least three measure that can be taken to solve the quota backlog:

1. Increase capacity of the APG school.

- a. Convert the medical facility on the Naval Support Activity, New Orleans grounds to barracks and office/classroom space to allow more sections/personnel per 2-week training period. This would require long-term planning, significant

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-08/1513-99 (CONTINUED)

allocation of construction/maintenance funds and would not provide a near-term solution for the present "temporary" backlog.

b. Authorize the COMNAVRESFOR schools coordinators to issue orders to 105% to 110% of the design capacity of each two-week session. Do this based on the historical "no show" or cancellation rate minimum value for the school, but make contingency arrangements (such as cots, sleeping bags, locker space, etc.) in the event that all ordered personnel actually report for duty. Real world and family crises will continue regardless of the pressure exerted by senior leadership, so research is required to optimize this vital resource to its maximum capacity. This will not increase costs, but will instantly raise utilization of existing capacity.

2. Implement a billet control number (BCN) system. This should be done at the schools coordinator level and expand the application acceptance window beyond the present 120 days. E.g., have all Reserve activities submit their list of personnel who have been recruited to the APG/AIA programs, but have not received the APG school nor orders to same through their respective echelon IV to the schools coordinator by 30 June each year (corresponding to the AT waiver date) for purpose of prioritizing associated BCNs by accession date (day-for-day seniority not based on pay grade). The first APG school dates in the next FY will be slated to clear the backlog from prior years and the "unknownable" numbers of APG/AIA accessions not having the required APG school and those numbers can be effectively managed outside of the order writing shop, as well as building a feedback mechanism to the recruiting command to prevent further "sprint and drift" methods of recruiting personnel into the Naval Reserve. Also, allow entry of these requests with BCNs for the next FY starting 1 August of each year for all the APG school dates required to clear the backlog. To cut down on the "no show" count, we can get the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve involved to solve employer-employee conflicts in this matter.

3. Evaluate feasibility of a second APG school. This could be done at an active duty base, such as SUBASE San Diego or NAVBASE Everett, which have existing firefighting and damage control trainers, as well as pools to provide increased capacity and have a location that provides priority service for Reserve activities west of the Mississippi River. This would entail additional Reserve manning or a memorandum of agreement with the active duty personnel or contracting of services to provide the same quality training as the Professional Development Center currently

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-08/1513-99 (CONTINUED)

provides. This would raise costs in the area of instructors, but would reduce costs of transportation to the site for western region activities and rapidly reduce the backlog of unfilled quota requirements.

**ACTION OFFICER:** YN1 William E. Goin  
NAVMARCORESCEN Harrisburg  
(717) 255-8070

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Agree that priority for APG school quotas should be given to those who have been in the program longest. Also, recommend that quota control for APG school conform to that for all other schools for Naval Reservists. For most schools, NRA training staffs obtain a quota; THEN an AT application is submitted for the time/location of the school. For APG school, the AT application acts as the quota request and if there is no APG school quota available for the dates requested, the AT application is rejected. This complicates the process and serves no useful purpose.

The planned transfer of APG school from New Orleans to RTC Great Lakes will eliminate many of the problems with the current APG/AIA school pipeline. Until that move takes place:

1.a. A second APG school location was set up in Gulfport, MS. This eliminates the need for exceptional measures to expand capacity in New Orleans.

1.b. Agree with the recommendation that COMNAVRESFOR overbook each APG class. While four in a room berthing in the same building is integral to the training environment, in the event that all scheduled attendees arrive for a particular class, assignment of one or two APGs to other quarters until attrition opens up spaces in the main berthing area is acceptable.

2. Agree that quota assignments should be allowed as early as possible. Class schedules should be stable throughout the FY and there is no reason to restrict quota assignment to only a 120-day window.

3. Establishment of the Gulfport school has created a second APG school site.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-08/1513-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. This problem needs to be addressed, although there is currently a change "in work" to shift APG training from New Orleans to RTC Great Lakes. This shift could solve the problem, if it occurs in a timely fashion.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** As of 23 February 1999, 2,130 Advance Pay Grade (APG) quotas are available at New Orleans, Gulfport, and RTC Great Lakes. Of these available quotas, 837 have been filled. The addition of the Great Lakes RTC to augment the APG/AIA training pipeline has eliminated the backlog problem.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-15-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-03/1521-99

**SUBJECT:** NATIONAL PROSPECTIVE COMMANDING/PROSPECTIVE EXECUTIVE  
OFFICER COURSE

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Christopher P. Moriarty  
GVTU 0415G  
(212) 208-1511

CAPT Kirk Unruh  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Four  
(609) 258-3305

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Naval Reserve unit commanding officers, especially junior ones, are frequently not fully prepared to be a unit CO. There is no national course used for preparing Naval Reserve unit Prospective COs (PCOs). On the active duty side, there is a PCO/PXO pipeline course for officers slated to be unit COs/XOs. The only such courses for Naval Reservists are locally prepared and offered at the echelon IV level. COMNAVRESFOR has produced a Reserve unit course on CD-ROM, but it lacks some important subject matter and it will be difficult to keep current.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Prepare a PCO course to be used nationally to train Reserve unit PCOs/PXOs. The course would be developed and presented in PowerPoint and then used to train the trainers, who would then go back to the echelon IV to teach the course. The example for the course would be the Naval Reserve Officer Leadership course which was developed by Naval Reservists in PowerPoint and then disseminated to the echelon IVs to teach. The prototype could be a PCO course developed in PowerPoint by NAVRESREDCOMREG Four.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LT Renee Joaquin  
NAVMARCORESCEN Wilmington, DE  
(302) 998-3328

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** On a national basis, the requirement exists to train Naval Reserve unit COs and XOs in a standardized format. NAVRESREDCOMREG Four has developed a PowerPoint prototype that is being recommended for forwarding to the appropriate authorizing agency.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-03/1521-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N7) DISCUSSION (CDR LANDON, 8-6514):** The CD-ROM based unit CO course (dated 25 Nov 97) is COMNAVSURFRESFORs national training course for PCOs/PXOs. This method of delivery allows individuals to study at their own pace and according to their work and training schedules. This course is reviewed annually for currency and is updated as major changes to the material occur and funding permits. Each NAVRESREDCOM is free to supplement the standardized course material and to conduct on-site training for PCOs/PXOs as funding allows. Several NAVRESREDCOMs have developed supplementary instruction and COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N7) is evaluating these for possible distribution to the field.

**COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N7) RECOMMENDATION:** That NAVRESREDCOMREG Four forward their prototype course to COMNAVSURFRESFOR (N7) for evaluation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Multiple avenues are currently available to provide leadership training to Prospective COs/XOs (PCO/PXO) SELRES, which include the COMNAVSURFRESFOR National Training Course (CD-ROM), the two-day Reserve Senior Leadership (RSL) Course, and the Leadership Training Continuum (LTC) as delineated in ALNAVRESFOR 18/97. Additional augmentation for leadership training is at the discretion of the REDCOM in support of a unit commanding officer.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.



**ITEM:** III-16-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-07/1570-99

**SUBJECT:** SUBMISSION OF INITIAL ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING ORDERS  
FOR ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG) PERSONNEL IN PROGRAM SEVEN  
(SEABEE) UNITS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Daniel Athey  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen  
(619) 532-1837; DSN 522-1837

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** For SEABEE program APGs, the requirement to attend school is tracked by the Reserve center but Annual Training (AT) order applications are submitted through the SEABEE unit to the Reserve Support Site (RSS). Lack of continuous communications between the SEABEE RSS and the center has resulted in centers and SEABEE APGs being unprepared for APG school and applications being delayed while the member is in the indoctrination process. Consequently, orders to APG school have been canceled due to miscommunication as to the school start dates and completion of attendance requirements (such as PRT and confirmation of swimming abilities).

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the responsibility for submission of initial AT orders on SEABEE APGs be transferred to the Reserve center responsible for tracking all other facets of the APG program. As the Reserve centers already track submission of all other APG school applications, this will consolidate the tracking and reduce the administrative burden on the unit and ensure less problems for the Naval Reserve Professional Development Center (APG school).

**ACTION OFFICER:** YNC(SW) Gerard  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen  
(619) 532-1881; DSN 522-1881

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Policy Board agrees this would expedite the order processing for APG students and ensure all requirements are met prior to going to APG school. Currently on many occasions Reserve centers are not aware an application has been submitted until the orders are received. This caused several quotas to be canceled at the last minute because all requirements were not met prior to going to school. This lowered the throughput at APG school, preventing maximum attendance for this most demanding school.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is recommended.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-07/1570-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** It is the consensus of the board that the infrastructure already exists for the tracking of AT orders by both the submitting Seabee RSS and servicing Naval Reserve Activity. Communication between the unit, RSS, and NRA should be used to its fullest capacity to ensure that personnel are prepared for initial accession training. Accountability for personnel mobilization readiness is and must remain the responsibility of the unit commanding officers/officers-in-charge.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-17-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-08/1570-99

**SUBJECT:** FLEET ACCESSIONS ARE NOT ALLOWED TO COMPLETE ANNUAL  
TRAINING (AT) THEIR FIRST YEAR AS A SELECTED RESERVE

**SUBMITTED BY:** AOCM(AW) Clifford Hitch  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen  
(619) 532-1842; DSN 522-1842

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Over the last few years, fleet accessions have not been allowed to go on AT the first year they affiliate with the Naval Reserve. Fleet accessions are actually the most valuable their first year in the Naval Reserve. They are the most current in their skills/specialty and would be a tremendous asset training our Selected Reservists side-by-side on AT or to their gaining command because their skills can be used virtually immediately requiring very little update.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Allow fleet accessions the opportunity to apply for AT their first year as a Selected Reservist as outlined in BUPERSINST 1001.39C.

**ACTION OFFICER:** AOCM(AW) Clifford Hitch

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** It would be advantageous to use fleet accessions who are already trained to provide immediate contributory support to meet the needs of the gaining commands. The policy, however, may be based on the inability of COMNAVSURFRESFOR to pay for AT of new accessions.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is recommended.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** AT participation guidance is issued annually by COMNAVRESFOR based upon funding available for the fiscal year. In COMNAVRESFOR FY99 Force Guidance 141304Z Oct 98, Fiscal Reserve Pay, Navy (RPN), Operations and Manpower Management message, and as clarified in FY99 Supplemental Force Guidance message 231300Z Nov 98, all FY99 accessions are encouraged to perform AT. COMNAVRESFOR is committed to obtaining 100 percent AT funding for the Selected Reserve Force.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-18-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-06/1571-99

**SUBJECT:** TAKING MEDICAL/DENTAL RECORDS ON ANNUAL TRAINING (AT)

**SUBMITTED BY:** HM1 Clyde Kazebee  
NAVRESCEN Fort Dix  
(609) 723-7160, ext 144

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Carrying health records to active duty training sites is largely unnecessary, except as required by certain specific training commands. Also, there are serious chain of custody implications. Medical records can be lost in transit. Naval Reserve activities have tracking and verifying responsibilities for records, yet cannot directly control their whereabouts once they have left the activity. Indeed, Chapter 6 of the Manual of the Bureau of Naval Medicine (MANMED) states that "a patient may not retain his/her original health record." hand-carrying original health records by unauthorized individuals is prohibited. the senior medical officer/medical department representative (MDR) shall be the custodian of the health record. Where there is not medical department, the health record will be kept with the member's service record.

The health record, in fact, provides very little helpful information to the gaining command. In the cast that the additional information is required by a treatment facility, liaison could be made with the record holding facility. Active duty personnel executing TAD orders do not routinely carry their health records with them. ALNAVRESFOR 10/97 and BUMED ltr of 11 Apr 98 eliminated the requirement for MDRs to certify a member PQ 90 days prior to executing AT orders. The requirement was eliminated because drilling Reservists are obligated to notify the MDR of any illness or injury which would preclude execution of orders, a requirement which is not printed explicitly on all sets of AT/ADT orders. Ergo, COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5B, 901(I), seems to contradict other guidance when it states "Reservists departing on AT/ADT will be given health and dental records with certification that they are physically qualified to perform AT/ADT."

**RECOMMENDATION:** Bring requirements in line with each other by eliminating the COMNAVRESFOR requirement to issue members their health records to carry onto AT.

**ACTION OFFICER:** HMC Eric Weidman  
Medical Department Head (N9)  
NAVRESCEN Fort Dix  
(609) 723-7160, ext 144

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-06/1571-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESCEN FORT DIX POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Members of the Board see no good reason for medical records to be carried on AT, except as required for additional medical screening at the gaining command. Documents attesting to inoculations or requests for additional information can be forwarded by electronic means from the Naval Reserve activity to the AT site at the request of the active duty gaining command.

**NAVRESCEN FORT DIX POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the above recommendation.

**ACTION OFFICER:** HMC Mark P. Livingston  
NAVMARCORESCEN Ebensburg  
(814) 472-5083

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** To ensure consistency between active duty personnel on TAD and SELRES on AT, we need to eliminate the requirement that SELRES carry medical records to AT unless they have required medical screening that needs to be performed during AT. If unplanned medical treatment is administered to the SELRES during AT, the same administrative procedures that are used for active duty members while on TAD would apply for SELRES.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval. Medical records should be treated the same way that dental records are treated, both active and Reserve.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5C and COMNAVSURFRESFORINST 3502.1C provide the current guidance for administrative procedures required for Naval Reservists to perform AT. These instructions have removed the requirement for Naval Reservists to carry their medical record with them on AT.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-19-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-01/1600-99

**SUBJECT:** JURISDICTION OF SELECTED RESERVE (SELRES) PERSONNEL  
DURING INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING (IDT) PERIODS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR L. E. Dove  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach  
(310) 732-5742

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Per COMNAVRESFOR P1600.2A, we do not have any legal jurisdiction for SELRES in between muster periods. Per BUPERSINST 1001.39C, the drill is identified as a minimum of 4 hours and a drill day is identified as going from 0730-1230 (with 1 hour counted for lunch) and 1230-1630 with the 1230 muster counting as two musters, one for morning and one for lunch. However, there is conflicting information from COMNAVRESFOR on how this is actually supposed to work.

**Example:** If we conduct a 4 hour morning drill, release the member for lunch, and the member decides to leave the drill location for lunch, we lose jurisdiction custody of the SELRES until they return for the 1230 muster. However, if we conduct the morning drill, and the member elects to eat at the drill site during the contract lunch, wanders around the compound and then returns for the 1230 muster, we have maintained jurisdiction on them the whole time. On the other hand, for medical purposes, if this same member who left had an accident while out at lunch we would consider it as if the member was still on drill status. This type of policy is uneven, confusing and needs to be reviewed and clarified.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Navy Policy Board request OJAG make a complete review of this issue.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR L. E. Dove

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The REDCOM Policy Board agreed with the CO, Long Beach recommendation. An incident occurred at NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach in which jurisdiction was lost during the lunch break and appropriate Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) action was not authorized. The Reserve center investigated and was told that no action was possible because the alleged event occurred at lunch while off Navy/DOD property.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-01/1600-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is recommended to determine a way that SELRES will be covered under the UCMJ from the morning muster to the end of the drill day.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Article 2 of the UCMJ governs when a service member is subject to military jurisdiction. Article 2 does not confer plenary jurisdiction over Reservists, but instead provides that jurisdiction is proper only when the Reservist is actually engaged in inactive duty training.

The imposition of jurisdiction over Reservists and the subsequent loss of jurisdiction is necessarily artificial. There will always be fringe cases because the period of IDT is a finite period. The UCMJ was promulgated to ensure obedience to orders and to provide a vehicle to discipline military members for offenses committed in areas beyond the jurisdictional reach of state or foreign governments. The Code is intended only as a supplement to state and federal law and not as a substitute.

The problem posed involves concerns that military members are afforded medical coverage while traveling to and from IDT periods, but are not subjected to military jurisdiction. This illustrates the point that IDT periods are finite and must necessarily have a beginning and an end - muster. Broader medical coverage is justifiable because travel to and from IDT is required for all Reserve personnel, and this travel provides some benefit to the particular service. Imposition of jurisdiction over Reservists' part IDT periods would be exceedingly difficult to manage because there would be no identifiable beginning and end, and those times would be equally as artificial as actual IDT periods.

BUPERSINST 1001.39C, Section 1203, provides a solution to this kind of jurisdictional dilemma. The instruction permits a NRA to incorporate the lunch meal into the IDT period, so long as the time for the meal is not credited toward the actual drill. Per the instruction, unit commanders are permitted to muster the Reservists out of the morning drill and immediately muster them back in for the afternoon drill, so long as the meal is provided at government expense. If Reservists are not kept at the NRA during lunch, then Article 2 of the UCMJ will not support jurisdiction over them.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-01/1600-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further  
consideration of this item is not recommended.



**ITEM:** III-20-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-10/1610-99

**SUBJECT:** PERIODIC EVALUATIONS FOR E-6 RESERVE PERSONNEL

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Jean-Pierre Ple  
NAVRESCEN Baltimore  
(202) 647-1073

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The annual periodic evaluations of E-6 personnel coincide every two years with change of command of Naval Reserve units. Besides the possibility of not being prepared in a timely manner because of the proximity of the unit turnover, new Commanding Officers (COs) can not possibly know the comparative performance of this group of individuals. Consequently, the evaluations of Reserve E-6 personnel, the next generation to become Chief Petty Officers, consistently get Ashort changed.≡

**RECOMMENDATION:** Change the E-6 evaluation period.

**ACTION OFFICER:** YN1 Lotsie Wooten  
NAVRESCEN Baltimore  
(410) 752-4561

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIX POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board concurs that the October turnover of Reserve unit COs and the 15 November submission requirement for E-6 evaluations creates a difficult situation for prospective COs to appropriately evaluate E-6 personnel. The possible alternatives identified by the Board include:

1. Require the departing NR unit CO to complete a Performance Information Memorandum (PIM) for E-6 personnel in the Reserve unit.
2. Change the reporting date of Reserve E-6 evaluations to 15 August.
3. Require Departure of Reporting Senior evaluations for E-6 personnel.
4. Do not change the 15 November reporting date, but require departing unit COs to certify that evaluations of E-6 personnel have been completed and discussed as a command turnover item. The complicated nature of this problem warrants consideration at a higher level.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 06-10/1610-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG SIX POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded for further consideration. The Board recommends that departing Reserve unit COs of Naval Reserve units be required (in BUPERS directive) to complete PIMs for E-6 personnel.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG SIX RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The submission of enlisted evaluations is a command leadership topic. BUPERSINST 1610.10 Navy Performance Evaluation and Counseling System requires submission of E-6 evaluations on 15 November of every year. Reporting senior changes of command prior to this date provide some challenges. There are, however, numerous approaches that are available to the commanding officer to achieve this goal (Performance Information Memorandum or early submission of the evaluation).

The consensus of the Board is to maintain the reporting date as promulgated in BUPERSINST 1610.10.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-21-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-09/1610-99

**SUBJECT:** OFFICER FITNESS REPORTS FOR OIC=S OF THE INTEGRATED  
CONUS MEDICAL OPERATIONS PLANS (ICMOP) MTF

**SUBMITTED BY:** YNCS(AW) Patricia H. Nicholson  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen  
(619) 532-1834; DSN 522-1834

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** COMNAVSURFRESFOR New Orleans LA 081308Z Oct 97 states the reporting senior for fitness reports on OICs of the ICMOP MTF units will be concurrent from the Naval Reserve activity (NRA). In the event the commanding officer of the NRA is junior to the OIC, the report must be forwarded to the first officer in the chain of command who is the Reserve commanding officer=s equal or senior in grade (i.e., OIC is a captain and senior to the NRA CO; the report is forwarded to the readiness commander). The fitness report is then forwarded to the commanding officer who will sign as regular reporting senior. In the event the unit commanding officer and the member being reported on are both captains in the same competitive category, the report is forwarded to the first flag officer in the chain of command for flag endorsement, in many cases this will also be the readiness commander. On several occasions the readiness commander who is senior to the unit commanding officer will serve as the reporting senior and in some cases may also sign a captain on captain flag endorsement.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the commanding officer of NRAs, regardless of rank, submit a Performance Information Memorandum (PIM) to the regular reporting senior to assist in evaluating performance during the reporting period. Per BUPERSINST 1610.10 (Series), a PIM may be used as an alternative to a non-mandatory concurrent report. This will aid in expediting the submission of the fitness report and alleviate the readiness commander from possibly reporting on the same individual twice within the same period.

**ACTION OFFICER:** YNCS(AW) Patricia H. Nicholson

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Policy Board agreed with this recommendation.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is recommended.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-09/1610-99 (CONTINUED)

Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Procedures for report of fitness of an officer senior to the reporting senior, commonly referred to as "rank inversion," are well established, as are procedures for concurrent reports. In the unique situation where the NRA CO is junior to the OIC and the concurrent reporting senior is the same rank in the same competitive category as the OIC, a single flag endorsement acknowledging each situation will suffice.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-22-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-02/1650-99

**SUBJECT:** DOWNGRADED AWARDS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Randy Nees  
SEW HQ N6 0666  
NAF Washington  
(W) (703) 808-6875

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Awards for enlisted members of the Naval Space Reserve Program (NSRP) appear to be routinely downgraded to Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medals (NAMs). The COMNAVAIRESFOR awards guidance, 9 May 97, was handed out quite some time ago at an NAF COs meeting. This memo indicates that a Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal (NCM) is appropriate for CPO end of tour awards. It does not appear that COMNAVAIRESFOR is abiding by their guidance.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Ensure that enlisted award nominations are evaluated based on merit, not on rank. Ensure an appropriate mix of NAMs and Aother awards are made available to enlisted members.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR McDowell  
NMORA 0166  
NAF Washington  
(H) (301) 871-3256; (W) (301) 929-2200

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur with the discussion as stated above.

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** We found this to be a problem with officers as well as enlisted awards and feel all awards should be evaluated on merit and not on rate/rank. Further, we would like to see the COMNAVAIRESFOR Awards Board provide feedback to commands whose submissions have been downgraded. This would allow the process to improve. The Board also feels COs/XOs of the NAFs should serve rotationally on the COMNAVAIRESFOR Awards Board in order to carry back to their SELRES units the Board's standards. This will also provide working level perspectives on the merit of the achievements brought before the Board. We also recommend that COMNAVAIRESFOR establish a solid standard for awards and adhere to it and promulgate changes to the standard in a timely manner.

**CO, NAF WASHINGTON RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for action.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-02/1650-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVVAIRESFOR has a standing awards board which reviews all awards immediately upon submission by field activities. The awards board is comprised of the Program Manager (O-4/O-5) for the command submitting the award and an Assistant Chief of Staff (O-5/O-6), who both review and make recommendations to the senior board member (O-6). Any award which is downgraded by the senior board member must be forwarded to the Deputy, COMNAVVAIRESFOR for final disposition. In the case of Meritorious Service Medals, the Deputy, COMNAVVAIRESFOR makes the final recommendation to COMNAVRESFOR, who submits the award recommendation to a similar board. Upon completion of that board, the award is then forwarded to the CNO for final disposition.

During CY98, the COMNAVVAIRESFOR Awards Board reviewed over 1,500 various personal awards. Of that total, 47 (3.1 percent) awards were downgraded. Standards which were applied to the awards process have been developed over many years and are followed by all three Reserve Force staffs. COs of Echelon IV commands have direct input to the Force Commander with their recommendations which are reviewed and acted upon accordingly.

Participation by field personnel on the COMNAVVAIRESFOR Awards Board would be difficult due to the large volume of awards processed and the fact that awards are processed through the board on a daily basis.

Feedback is always available from the senior board member to commands whose submissions have been downgraded. Statistics on timeliness and specific awards are available upon request.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-23-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-04/1700-99

**SUBJECT:** COMMISSARY BENEFITS

**SUBMITTED BY:** ABHC Theodore A. Robb  
CV NE 0366  
NAF Washington  
(W) (410) 859-7500; (H) (410) 747-0828

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Yearly commissary usage saving money not having to use a commissary card.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Full commissary privileges for all.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Anderson  
VTU 6666  
NAF Washington

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Recommend that full commissary privileges be instated for Naval Reservists, using only ID cards for access.

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with above recommendation.

**CO, NAF WASHINGTON RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for action.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The 1998 COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board forwarded Item I-6 "Full Commissary Privileges" to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board (NNRPB) recommending a change in law to permit unlimited commissary benefits for all Reserve personnel. The 1998 NNRPB report dated 19 January 1999 supports current legislative efforts to increase the number of days Reservists may use the commissary and urges restricted use be eliminated in its entirety. This item has been forwarded to the Reserve Forces Policy Board for consideration.

The Board notes that some relief has already been provided. Per COMNAVRESFOR 231400Z Dec 98, the FY99 National Defense Authorization Act increased access to commissary stores from 12 to 24 calendar days for Ready Reserve members.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-24-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-05/1800-99

**SUBJECT:** VESTED RETIREMENT

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Sondra A. Even  
ASP 1366  
NAF Washington  
(W) (301) 866-5804

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Military members are not vested in a retirement plan until 20 years of service. No benefit are transferable until that point. This is not in sync with benefits provided to other federal employees, nor industry standard.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Develop a transitional plan.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR K. Weinstein  
ASP 0466  
NAF Washington

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Develop a transitional plan for current members and a new plan for new accessions that model A401K plans. This provides multiple benefits:

1. Puts management of retirement funds back in the hands of the individual.
2. Resolves high cost of Annuity approach that the current retirement system provides, due to increasing life expectancy.
3. By-passes perceptions of Abenefits erosion.
4. Provides a benefit to members who are forced out before their 20 years.
5. Allows room for others to move up and frees up rates that are overmanned.

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAF WASHINGTON RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for action.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Because of the unique mission of the Naval Reserve, the Department of Defense does not match Reservists' benefits with benefits provided to other



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-05/1800-99 (CONTINUED)

federal employees, nor does it try to mirror civilian industry standards.

IRA=s, Certificates of Deposit and other investments are available to both military members and civilians. These investments will supplement the retirement program of all who choose to participate.

It is the consensus of the Board that the primary focus of our support for changes in retirement benefits must be toward the removal of the REDUX Retirement System for all military personnel, providing for an increase in the retirement pay percentage from the existing 40 percent to the pre-1986 standard of 50 percent of base pay at 20 years.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-25-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-01/2090-99

**SUBJECT:** WEEKLY OR MONTHLY NAVAL RESERVE NEWSLETTER TO BE  
DISTRIBUTED BY E-MAIL

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Christopher P. Moriarty  
GVTU 0415G  
(212) 208-1511

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Communication with Naval Reservists concerning announcements, policies, advancements, etc., has always been a problem because we usually meet only monthly and are often away from our home Reserve activities. This results in a lack of timely information being disseminated to Naval Reservists. The Naval Reserve has a monthly publication, Naval Reservist News (NRN), that has much of this information, but it is frequently dated. Use of various web pages has assisted in more timely communications with Reservists, but more efforts at speeding up communications can be made. The Chief of Information has a weekly newsletter, Navy News This Week, that is disseminated by e-mail weekly to anyone that subscribes. Subscription is very easy; it just requires sending an e-mail to CHINFO and a program automatically subscribes (or unsubscribes) the individual to the e-mail service.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That COMNAVRESFOR initiate a weekly e-mail newsletter service to notify Naval Reservists of timely matters such as:

- Unit commissionings and decommissionings
- Uniform regulation changes
- The results of promotion and selection boards being reported out
- Dates of advancement examinations
- Dates for submissions to promotion and selection boards
- Recalls to active duty and deployments of Naval Reserve units
- Major changes of command
- Changes in military pay and benefits of taxation of Naval Reserve pay
- Changes in Navy policy
- Release of AT opportunity messages
- Other items of interest to Naval Reservists

The e-mail would then reference specific locations where additional information on the above matters could be found, such as where the full promotion list is available on a web site. The generation of this e-mail could be done at minimal incremental

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-01/2090-99 (CONTINUED)

financial cost. The newsletter could be written by Naval Reserve PAO personnel. The Navy already has software to maintain e-mail address lists. A weekly Naval Reserve e-mail could be a very powerful tool in keeping Naval Reservists informed with very timely information.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Cheryl L. Austin  
NAVRESCEN Fort Dix  
(609) 723-7160

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Using e-mail to disseminate timely, Reserve-related issues would supplement current communications channels. In order to avoid an onslaught of "information overload," simplicity should be the goal.

Interested Reservists should have the option of subscribing to a weekly e-mail that contains recent announcements of newsworthy Naval Reserve topics. Each announcement would be a one-line item that has a "hot link" to a more detailed discussion at a related web site. This would enable anyone desiring additional information about a topic to "click on" the topic and have immediate access to the detailed discussion. If the hot link is not possible, each announcement could be followed by a web site address which would be accessed at the Reservist's convenience.

The monthly publication, NRN, is one of the existing web sites. On-line publication of NRN supplements U.S. Postal Service distribution of the newsletter. The on-line edition can be accessed earlier than the hard-copy and should be accessible directly from the weekly e-mail message.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. This would provide a centralized location to access information on all Naval Reserve topics.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Communication methods to keep Naval Reservists informed of opportunities and policy changes are extremely important. Information is currently being disseminated through various means including WEB pages at every echelon, Naval Reservist News (also available on a WEB site), Navy Times, e-mail, etc. It is the consensus of the Board that providing additional information of this type by the PAO office or any other department would be redundant and unnecessary.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-01/2090-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further  
consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-26-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-03/3500-99

**SUBJECT:** ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN OF THE UNIT TRAINING SCHEDULE  
(UTS)

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR A. J. Nolan  
NR ATGPAC DET 119  
NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The UTSs requirement that every Selected Reservist (except the CO/XO) be accounted for every hour of both drill days, places an unnecessary administrative burden on the units as well as creating an unrealistic and bogus report. Guidance regarding the input into the UTS strongly discourages annotating work center or administrative work. The UTS wants to see training conducted each hour of every drill weekend (16 hours total). Realistically, although training of Reservists is still a high priority, there is a lot of administrative work being conducted that is necessary. The UTS is a tedious, time-consuming paperwork drill. From the standpoint of a training officer preparing and managing the report as well as from an inspector's view, reviewing the UTS for accuracy and legitimacy, the UTS falls short in accurately reflecting training for all hands. More man-hours are lost manipulating and massaging the UTS that should be spent actually training. Small units do not have the manpower to devote to the UTS and larger units need to assign 1-2 people for the entire drill weekend just to prepare the UTS. Units routinely lose personnel during the drill weekend because they are out providing support to the active duty Navy. As this focus continues to increase, more Reservists will routinely provide contributory support and the need to document every hour of training will cease to exist. Reserve commanding officers should be responsible to ensure their personnel are gainfully employed, either through training being conducted or providing support, and focus on the proper documentation of training and not the administrative nightmare of the UTS.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That COMNAVRESFOR review the functional ability and need of the UTS in its current form.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR L. E. Dove  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach  
(310) 732-5742

**CO, NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH RECOMMENDATION:** As we continue to increase contributory support man-days trying to document every hour of a drill weekend of every Reservist becomes fruitless and

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-03/3500-99 (CONTINUED)

an unnecessary burden for both the Reserve unit and full time support personnel.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Agree this is an administrative burden to the units.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is recommended. Limit the use of the UTS to requesting requirements for outside assistance, e.g., training to be conducted by the Naval Reserve activity, exportable type training or request for IDTT.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Units that dedicate the majority of their drill time performing peacetime contributory support may have a legitimate concern with the need to dedicate a significant amount of time to the use of the automated UTS. Article 3501 in the Surface Master Training Plan (COMNAVSURFRESFORINST 3502.1C) addresses this issue and provides the option of utilizing a non-automated system.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-27-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-10/4000-99

**SUBJECT:** MODIFICATION OF THE 50-MILE BERTHING LIMIT INTO TWO-TIERED MILEAGE CRITERIA

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Sinoply/HMC Durland  
NR NAVHOSP Jacksonville 108  
NAVMARCORESCEN West Palm Beach  
(561) 687-3954

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Numerous conversations over the years have centered on reducing or extending the mileage limits used to qualify Reservists for weekend berthing. Through all the conversations, there is still the issue of people who live on the fringe of the "as-the-crow-flies" limit. In some locales of the United States, 45 to 49 miles could result in a drive of well over an hour. As a result, there is still a need to consider the personnel affected by this rule and to look at another option.

The current 50-mile limit now entitles personnel two nights of berthing (Friday and Saturday). An alternate solution to the 50-mile rule would be to develop a two-tiered approach to the mileage rule. The first tier would be for those Reservists on the fringe of the current limit and a little beyond. This first tier would qualify Reservists for one night's berthing (Saturday). The second tier would be for Reservists further out who have an even more extended trip to the Reserve activity. This two-tiered approach would allow Reservists to have a safe commute to their drill site, help control Reserve funding and improve morale for those personnel living on the 50-mile fringe. It would minimize the number of personnel who currently get two nights of berthing and still provide a level of safety typical to a normal days commute.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Consider developing a two-tiered mileage limit for single (Saturday) and two night (Friday and Saturday) berthing.

Tier 1: 45 to 60 Miles - Any Reservist living within a 45 to 60 mile radius (as-the-crow-flies) of their parent Reserve activity would be entitled to berthing for a single night (Saturday).

Tier 2: 60 Miles and Above - Any Reservist living beyond the 60 mile radius would be entitled to two nights (Friday and Saturday) berthing.

**NAVMARCORESCEN WEST PALM BEACH DISCUSSION:** The contract berthing issue is a constant topic of discussion among drilling Reservists. The discussion surrounding this proposal was that

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-10/4000-99 (CONTINUED)

the suggested two-tiered system could actually save on berthing costs by providing only one night of berthing to a percentage of SELRES. In actuality, for this Reserve center, the cost would increase because approximately 30 personnel reside between 45 and 50 miles from the center. They are not eligible for berthing now, but would be under the suggested system.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR R. N. Mauldin  
NR MOMAU 6  
NAVRESCEN Charleston  
(843) 743-8620

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur with originator regarding the two-tier mileage limit. Less than 50 miles no contract berthing.

Tier 1: 50-74 miles: one night only.

Tier 2: 75 miles or greater: two nights.

Note: Travel must be by the most direct route. However, waivers may be authorized by the CO of the drill site when local terrain or large bodies of water for those personnel who live within 50 to 74 miles of the drill site.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The mileage limit must be increased to 75 miles to reduce the continuous escalating costs of contract berthing. Berthing is a privilege not an entitlement. The Reserve center CO has the authority to change the start time of drill on Saturday morning to 0830 to allow members time for travel. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. In fact, a two-tier system is already in place at several NAVRESREDCOMREG Eight Reserve centers on a voluntary basis. Saturday morning drills are adjusted to accommodate later arrivals. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR has established policy for berthing eligibility in COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1. It is the consensus of the Board that there should be no changes to the mileage limits prescribed.

The Board will forward a separate recommendation to the National Naval Reserve Policy Board to seek specific funding for Naval Reserve IDT berthing.



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-10/4000-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further  
consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM** III-28-99

**COMBINED ORIGINATOR NUMBERS:** 08-26/4000-99, VA-01/4000-99 AND  
WA-07/1700-99

**SUBJECT:** CONTRACT BERTHING

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR policy for Selected Reserve berthing issues is provided in COMNAVRESFOR Instruction P4000.1, which is applicable to all SELRES while performing IDT at their regular drill site. These accommodations are "contracted" by the Naval Reserve and as such, are government property for the specific use of the Naval Reserve member in the official performance of his/her duties. In addition, military personnel occupying government quarters are afforded certain rights and protection which are not available to civilians occupying these rooms. Reservists on IDT are covered, but non-members are not.

It is the consensus of this Board that to provide a manageable and equitable program for all members, regardless of their Reserve Activity, no changes to the current instruction are recommended.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-26/4000-99 (COMBINED WITH VA-01/4000-99  
AND WA-07-1700-99)

**SUBJECT:** ADDITIONAL CHARGE FOR SINGLE OCCUPANCY IN BACHELOR  
QUARTERS

**SUBMITTED BY:** NAVMARCORESCEN Orlando  
(407) 646-5991

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** If a member has their spouse or other family member stay in the barracks with them, the member must pay for the entire room. This requirement is being interpreted from COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1 (p. V-2-2). The instruction states that if a bed is used by a non-military type that could be used by a Navy member, the bed must be paid for. Unfortunately, this requirement for double occupancy rooms is being used for single occupancy rooms where a second Navy member could not occupy in any case. As an example, if a Navy member in a room with one bed has his spouse stay, he is required to pay for the entire room. It makes sense that the Navy member pay the additional house keeping charge, but if the spouse is in no way displacing a Navy member by staying in the barracks, charging the member is ridiculous.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend removing the requirement for the member to pay for a room because a spouse is staying if the room is a single occupancy room.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Mauldin  
NR MOMAU 6  
NAVRESCEN Charleston  
(843) 743-8620

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur with originator. Request clarification/modification of COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1 single occupancy rooms (one bed only) with regards to members sharing the room with their spouse. This will not displace another military member. Additional cost should be charged for housekeeping only.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** VA-01/4000-99 (COMBINED WITH 08-26/4000-99  
AND WA-07/1700-99)

**SUBJECT:** ACCOMPANIED BERTHING REIMBURSEMENT

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR David Stitzlein  
NR TACRON 2286  
NAVAIRES Norfolk  
(302) 317-1616, ext 120

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1 now excludes a member from reimbursement if accompanied by dependents, but will pay if unaccompanied. For many out of area drillers, the drill weekend is the only opportunity for dependents to interact with other unit personnel and become integrated into the Naval Reserve family. This policy only serves to discourage dependent participation and integration.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Modify the policy, allowing the member to pay the difference between the rate for single occupancy and when accompanied by dependents.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LT D. L. Dennis  
NAVAIRES Norfolk (N72)  
(757) 444-1494; DSN 564-1494

**NAVAIRES NORFOLK POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** This topic was debated among the Board members and the NAVAIRES supply chief. It was explained that the issue actually revolved around accounting and audit data. The Board felt that it would satisfy supply=s requirements and appease the Reservists by developing separate billing that would not interfere with supply=s data. In the Board=s eyes, it is unfair to refuse to pay for the member=s portion for berthing simply because they are accompanied by a spouse. After all, the member has to be there anyway. Members are not advocating that the USNR pay the extra cost of a dependent, but only the cost of the Reservist. As for the issue of appropriateness, spouses are entitled to lodging in the BOQ with their Reservist spouses just like an active duty spouse is entitled to the same privilege. It is inappropriate to single out a specific group, intentionally or unintentionally, by denying them the same privilege their active counterpart enjoys. Also, the current policy encourages Reservists to pay on the side or lie about occupancy, the latter of which just denies revenue to the BOQs. It can also be viewed as a safety factor. Some Reservists drive long distances to drill at NAVAIRES Norfolk after putting in a full workday. Many spouses accompany to assist with the drive so the Reservists are not placed in an

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** VA-01/4000-99 (COMBINED WITH 08-26/4000-99  
AND WA-07/1700-99) (CONTINUED)

unnecessarily dangerous fatigue situation. The Board felt that this issue could become a retention issue. The Board also felt that the current policy does discourage families from participating in Naval Reserve activities that could be beneficial in the event of a member's recall and subsequent deployment. The fact that larger Navy installations have an advantage over smaller Reserve centers in berthing facilities was not seen as a valid reason for not changing the policy.

**NAVAIRES NORFOLK POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration. The current situation could easily be changed to pay the members cost while excluding the extra cost of the spouse. The Naval Reserve would not be spending any more money than had already been budgeted for berthing in the first place. Separate billing already exists for phone calls. The extra charge for a spouse could be added to that bill so that the actual room bill turned into supply for accounting would appear as normal. That is, it would only indicate payment for the member.

**CO, NAVAIRES NORFOLK RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. This is the second year that this same request was made by the local Board (was disapproved by LACAIR last year). This is a benefit that would not be available to all members at all sites, but if single rooms are already being bought by the Naval Reserve for given individuals, it does seem odd to pay for the room at all if a spouse is added to the room.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** VA-01/4000-99 (COMBINED WITH 08-26/4000-99  
AND WA-07/1700-99) (CONTINUED)

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-07/1700-99

**SUBJECT:** REVISIT POLICY OF ALLOWING SPOUSES TO ACCOMPANY  
DRILLING SELRES AUTHORIZED CONTRACT BILLETING DURING  
IDT DRILLS AT REGULAR DRILL SITE

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Randy Quinn  
NR NAS 0189 Chaplain  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island  
(360) 757-8963

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** According to COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1 of May 1997, Section 5024, para a.9), page V-2-1: ASELRES performing scheduled drills who elect to bring their spouse/guest are NOT authorized to occupy government provided berthing (commercial or BQ). EXCEPTION: Member=s spouse is also a Naval Reservist performing scheduled drills.≡ The originator of this policy issue believes this may be a safety concern if it causes SELRES to make long back and forth commutes due to this restriction and it is an unnecessary morale hit that can be easily remedied.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend the P4000.1 be changed to allow dependent spouses to stay at BQs where Reservists are assigned Anon-shared≡ rooms, and the SELRES drilling will pay the additional cost for the extra person directly to the BQ, therefore not requiring any special arrangements with the supply office that arranges the contract billeting. This should not apply to commercial hotels, but to BQ only, and on a space-available , not-to-interfere basis. The dependent spouse MUST have a valid ID card to be able to use this facility in this manner.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Robert J. Tate  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island Manpower Officer  
(360) 257-6942

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board believed that such a change, if not abused, would be a most welcome modification for those SELRES members in a position to use BQs in this manner on a case-by-case basis.

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**CO, NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Board=s recommendation.

**ITEM:** III-29-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-28/4000-99

**SUBJECT:** BACHELOR QUARTERS FOR NON-PAY MEMBERS

**SUBMITTED BY:** Chief Petty Officers Association  
NAVMARCORESCEN Orlando  
(407) 646-5991

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** If a Naval Reservist is on no-cost orders, the member is not able to stay in the barracks. This causes a personal hardship.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That regulations be changed to allow non-pay personnel to stay in the barracks.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR R. N. Mauldin  
NR MOMAU 6  
NAVRESCEN Charleston  
(843) 743-8620

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Concur. Due to the shrinking number of active duty personnel, a major emphasis has been placed on the Naval Reserve Force. It is suggested that berthing be provided for personnel with no-cost orders. COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1, chapter V2-2, causes a hardship to members willing to carry out a Navy mission at no-cost orders to the government due to limited IDTT funds. Often times, these SELRES are willing and able to mobilize within 72 hours. Recommend that Reserve centers and REDCOMs provide berthing requirements. The member should not be denied government quarters when traveling on no-cost orders and when space AA is available.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR policy, as indicated in COMNAVRESFOR P4000.1, sets berthing eligibility requirements and reference page V-2-2 identifies no cost IDTT as not an entitlement and not authorized. COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5C stipulates, on page 6-6, that if the member accepts no cost orders, there is no reimbursement authorized. The member may either accept or decline those orders.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-28/4000-99 (CONTINUED)

consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-30-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-04/4000-99

**SUBJECT:** INITIAL ISSUE OF PHYSICAL TRAINING CLOTHING FOR NAVAL  
RESERVE PERSONNEL

**SUBMITTED BY:** PNC Ternaham  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** New Naval Reservists are not issued standard t-shirts and shorts for PRT activity. The current uniform allowance does not include the issue of standard PT gear. Issue of PT gear would aid members in identifying with the Naval Reserve and build feelings of membership.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Issue PT gear with standard Navy markings during the first drill weekend. Authorize Naval Reserve supply departments to locally procure and issue PT gear on the same basis as with other uniform items.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, recommending approval.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The current Navy "seabag" as defined in Navy Uniform Regulations (NAVPERS 15665I) and BUPERSNOTE 1020 does not include PT gear as an issue item. Newly recruited members on Active Duty are required to pay for their PT gear via payroll deduction. Athletic shoes, shorts, and shirts are a matter of personal choice, and with styles and technology continuously changing, it would be unreasonable to expect a "uniform" outfit to remain current for any reasonable length of time. Expense and staffing would also make this undesirable and unreasonable. It is the responsibility of the individual and the leadership of the command to ensure that all PT apparel is appropriate in style and taste.

It is the consensus of the Board that the present policy remain in place.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-31-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-02/5050-99

**SUBJECT:** REQUIRED RESERVE CONFERENCES

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR L. E. Dove  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach  
(310) 732-5743

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Every year, various Reserve officer and enlisted communities have scheduled required conferences. In many cases, they have managed to have these requirements added on as training requirements on Individual Training Plans (ITP) so they could request funding to attend. Just a few of the annual conferences include AMSUS for medical, multiple REDCOM technical training (one on each coast) for EDOs, the JAG conference and numerous supply conferences. To exacerbate the issue, some communities require all members to attend which impacts on the performance of the unit. Time to attend these conferences is time taken away from meeting gaining command requirements. As we focus more and more on providing service to gaining commands, we need to let the customer (gaining command) determine what is required for individual training. The only conferences that the Naval Reserve should support are conferences required by the gaining command, such as commanding officer conferences.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Request COMNAVSURFRESFOR notify the individual communities that we will no longer support the community conferences as training requirements unless required by the gaining command.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR L. E. Dove

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Policy Board agreed with this recommendation.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Define any conference attendance as professional development and have gaining commands validate requirements for any conference.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVSURFRESFOR is required to validate requirements for Unit Training Conferences. Units occasionally add training requirements for conferences without consulting gaining commands.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-02/5050-99 (CONTINUED)

Additionally, it is recognized that gaining commands define many of the training requirements in a unit's Individual Training Plan (ITP), including required conferences, to address their contributory support and mobilization requirements. Program managers, in conjunction with unit gaining commands, presently provide the requisite oversight to validate those requirements. Additional validation is not required.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-32-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-01/5210-99

**SUBJECT:** EXPANSION OF RUAD CAPABILITIES

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Thomas P. George  
NR TSC 0389  
NAVAIRES NAS Whidbey Island  
(360) 479-5747

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Reserve Unit Assignment Documents (RUADs) only document the top two Naval Enlisted Codes (NECs) or Naval Officer Billet Classifications (NOBCs) of each SELRES member, even if they have more than two. Also, some billets require a specific NEC/NOBC, and with the current setup it is possible for the mandatory NOBC/NEC to fail to appear on the RUAD, with the Anon-essential≡ NEC/NOBCs appearing instead.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend new software be developed which will afford greater capability for desired data fields to be shown, making the RUAD serve unit training officers more effectively.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Thomas P. George

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The board agreed that the RUAD should be designed to serve as the most effective management tool possible. If the current RSTARS version is unable to make these changes, the next generation system to replace RSTARS should have this recommended capability incorporated into it.

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**CO, NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Board=s recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Reserve Unit Assignment Document (RUAD) reflects primary and secondary NEC/NOBC information, consisting of the NEC/NOBC required for the billet and those held by the member. Billets do not normally require more than two NECs/NOBCs and need not be reflected on the RUAD.

The Naval Reserve Personnel Center (NRPC) will re-sequence mandatory NEC/NOBC information upon request. Also, a complete listing of a member=s NEC/NOBC information may be found in the service record and Enlisted/Officer Summary Records.

ORIGINATOR NUMBER: WA-01/5210-99 (CONTINUED)

1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION: Further  
consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-33-99

**COMBINED ORIGINATOR NUMBERS:** DC-07/5234-99 AND PM-01/5230-99

**SUBJECT:** COMPUTER HARDWARE/SOFTWARE

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFOR ALNAVRESFOR 02/99 has directed the Forcewide use of Microsoft Office Suite 97 by 1 April 1999.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-07/5234-99 (COMBINED WITH PM-01/5230-99)

**SUBJECT:** UPGRADING SOFTWARE

**SUBMITTED BY:** LT Pamela Shields  
NAF Washington  
(W) (240) 857-5504

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Even  
ASP 1366  
NAF Washington

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** With the increasing amount of disparity between software applications, releases and disk operating systems, significant problems are continuing.

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Upgrade software to a common operating system (i.e., Windows 95) that will support a current office software package and standardize USNR to that software that is standard to other military components, including USN. Currently, information systems on the USN side and most military components call for the standardization of Windows 95/98 and the compatible MS office suite of applications. The current USNR applications are not compatible with the active duty side in most cases, and defeat the goal of Aone seamless Navy.≡ In addition to the above, there needs to be an established information system point of contact at the local level.

**CO, NAF WASHINGTON RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for action.



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-01/5230-99 (COMBINED WITH DC-07/5234-99)

**SUBJECT:** AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS (AIS) HARDWARE AND  
SOFTWARE COMPATIBILITY WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
(DOD) AND NAVY (DON)

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR Chet Seto  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The Naval Reserve is out of step with the rest of DOD and DON where office automation is concerned. Currently, the Naval Reserve is primarily using Corel WordPerfect, Quattro Pro and GroupWise, vice IT21 compliant software like Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint and Microsoft Exchange. Most commands are purchasing licenses and software for both Corel and Microsoft products to remain fully compatible with other DOD commands and most of our Selected Reservists. This is a waste of money and computer space.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Instead of using two separate software packages, purchase only IT21 compliant software in the Naval Reserve.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, recommending approval.

**ITEM:** III-34-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** PM-08/5230-99

**SUBJECT:** REPROGRAMMING OF AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS (AIS)  
SOFTWARE

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR William Lloyd  
NAVAIRES Point Mugu  
(805) 989-7296; DSN 351-7296

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Existing AIS software disallows optional fields to be added to AIS-generated Reserve unit recall bills. Additional fields are critical in the event of mobilization.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Program existing AIS software enabling more optional fields to be added to the current recall bill application, i.e., pager and cellular phone numbers, as well as e-mail addresses. Optional fields would give Reserve units two or more alternative ways of notifying members during ARecall Drills or LERTCONS and effectively disseminate information. Also, the e-mail address capability would significantly enhance communication and dissemination of information, minus additional postal costs incurred.

**NAVAIRES POINT MUGU POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** The Board concurs with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAVAIRES POINT MUGU RECOMMENDATION:** Concur, recommending approval.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The current Reserve Standard Training, Administration, and Readiness Support (RSTARS) program will be replaced by the Naval Standard Integrated Personnel System (NSIPS), which is an improved personnel management program to be field tested in the April 1999 time frame. This system is expected to give the Naval Reserve an improved information management system. Data element additions or change recommendations should be submitted via the procedures outlined in COMNAVRESFORINST 5231.2E.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-35-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-01/5234-99

**SUBJECT:** RESERVE TRAINING SUPPORT SYSTEM (RTSS) SOFTWARE

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Rob McDowell  
NMORA 0166  
NAF Washington  
(H) (301) 871-3256; (W) (301) 929-2200

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The current RTSS software used by NAF Washington is an out-dated, DOS-based program.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The RTSS software should be revised or updated to a windows-type program, with upgrades to training laptops.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR R. K. Weinstein  
ASP 0466  
NAF Washington

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The RTSS system software should be compatible with Windows 95 or better.

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Update the RTSS software to a windows-based program since the current system is not usable with other systems used for SELRES administration.

**CO, NAF WASHINGTON RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board concurs with the originator's suggestion that we need to improve our information management systems. COMNAVRESFORINST 5231.2E provides guidance on submission of recommendations for these improvements and the venue for submitting requests. Per COMNAVRESFOR (N61), an unfunded request has been submitted to update RTSS.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-36-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 11-02/5300-99

**SUBJECT:** FUNDING OF NAVAL RESERVE BILLETS AT THE JOINT UNIFORMED  
COMMANDS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR David W. Birt  
NAVRESCEN Corpus Christi  
DSN 861-2243

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Partial or inconsistent funding of Naval Reserve billets at the nine Unified Commands creates a negative impact on both the members of the Naval Reserve and the warfighting readiness of the Unified Commanders.

Naval Reservists have become a vital part of the Joint Unified Commands warfighting team. Amongst many other functions, Naval Reservists perform as command center watch officers and watchstanders, key members of the staff themselves and are utilized for exercise support and wartime planning. In providing a core of trained manpower in support of exercises, Naval Reservists play a vital role in the reduction of active component PERSOITEMPO by reducing the need to rely on TAD active component personnel.

In FY-98, the Joint Staff, in conjunction with the Unified Commands and the services, conducted a zero base review of Unified Command wartime augmentation requirements. It resulted in 2,600-plus Navy Selected Reserve requirements identified by the Unified Commanders validated and funded. This was supported by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC), the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the three services. The Joint Staff and OSD FY-98 Defense Planning Guidance called for full funding of Reserve manpower requirements at the Unified Commands. Yet, each year these billets, which amount only about 3% of total Naval Selected Reserve end strength, come under threat of reduction.

These validated requirements consist of both officer and enlisted billets. They provide the Naval Reserve Force with a sizeable number of O5-O8 billets. Such billets are in high demand and support individual career progression. Based on the geographical location of the Unified Commands, these billet opportunities are located in all parts of the country as well as OUTCONUS. Many of our qualified officer and enlisted personnel actively seek assignment to these billets. Maintaining 100% funding of these billets supports our own program and clearly and economically displays the Naval Reserve Force's commitment to joint operations in support of the National Military Strategy.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 11-02/5300-99 (CONTINUED)

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the Naval Reserve Force support full and consistent funding of joint Reserve billets at the Unified Commands.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ELEVEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Growing importance of joint operations requires Naval Reservists to be fully entrenched in Unified Command billets to ensure relevancy in time of need. Attempting to Aplus-up≅ Selected Reservists in joint billets during a crisis could create confusion at a time calling for seamless integration.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ELEVEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG ELEVEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Naval Reserve Force actively supports full and consistent funding of all Reserve billets, and the manning of billets worldwide. The Naval Reserve Force, however, does not identify nor fund billets. In this case, the Joint Staff have identified their requirements for Unified Commands. The Resource Sponsor(s) must fund these billets, and in many instances, not all of the requirements can be funded because of limited resources, which become unfunded requirements. The Resource Sponsor for Unified Command billets is CNO (N1).

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-37-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-04/5400-99

**SUBJECT:** RESERVE UNIT COLLATERAL DUTY REQUIREMENTS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR L. E. Dove  
CO, NAVMARCORESCEN Long Beach  
(310) 732-5742

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Within the Reserve chain of command, we take administrative, collateral duty requirements that are directed to commissioned active duty commands and require our Reserve units to meet the same standards through a literal interpretation of the requirement.

Two examples: All units must have designated in writing a public affairs officer and all units must have a designated career counselor who has attended the two-week Career Information Course. There are many Reserve units that have 10-20 assigned billets and to require them to meet all of the same collateral duty assignments is not practical and, I suspect, not the intent of the drafters of the original requirements. In this day of doing maximum contributory support, we should remove any administrative requirement that could be managed by another level of the organization.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That COMNAVSURFRESFOR review all administrative collateral duty requirements to see if they are applicable and then task the Reserve activity or the readiness command to provide these duties for the Reserve units.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR L. E. Dove

**NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board agreed that the responsibility of adequately filling collateral duty assignments for smaller Reserve units is an administrative burden and thereby, not practical. COMNAVSURFRESFOR should review all administrative collateral duty requirements to see if they are applicable and then task the Reserve activity or the readiness command to provide these duties for small (20 personnel or less assigned) Reserve units. Some concern was voiced over the Reserve units losing control of these collateral duties, especially if the unit had a qualified or interested candidate for a specific collateral duty. In such cases, the Board agreed that the unit commanding officer and the Naval Reserve activity CO would work out the details and logistics of the collateral duty assignment.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 19-04/5400-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESREDCOMREG Nineteen Policy Board.

**CO, NAVMARCORESCEN LONG BEACH RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** That a team be formed to validate the required collateral duties for each type and/or size of unit.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded for further consideration of this item.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG NINETEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVSURFRESFOR reviews administrative requirements at lower echelons. COMNAVSURFRESFORINST 5400.8 defines the support relationships among Naval Reserve Readiness Commands, Naval Reserve Centers, and Reserve units. This instruction provides the methodology to deviate from the supporting requirements of the center. If the unit is unable to meet all collateral duty requirements, a method is available to pass unit responsibilities to higher echelons via written memorandum of understanding at the local level, with a copy to the cognizant Immediate Superior in Command.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-38-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** DC-06/5400-99

**SUBJECT:** GAINING COMMAND INTEGRATION

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Steve Howse  
NAF Washington (N88)  
(W) (410) 765-2223

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** As currently structured, Reservists answer to Atwo masters: Echelon IV and gaining commands. This results in inefficiency administratively and hinders the Asingle force concept.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Let the gaining commands administer those Reservists who drill with them.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Silvester  
ASP 0566  
NAF Washington

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Gaining commands should be empowered to perform administrative functions for the SELRES that drill with them on a regular basis, including ETs, RSs, travel authorization, FITREPs and pay.

**NAF WASHINGTON POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the above recommendation.

**CO, NAF WASHINGTON RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation. Forward to COMNAVRESFOR for action.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Some gaining commands are currently performing various administrative function supporting requirements of members of the Naval Reserve (i.e, drill schedules and evaluations/fitness reports). The vehicle to accomplish this objective is a Memorandum of Understanding between the active command and the Reserve unit. However, most gaining commands are not equipped or staffed to administer Naval Reserve personnel, especially in areas of specialized documentation (i.e, drill rescheduling documentation, travel authorization and pay processing). Until such time as funding and staffing for specialized Reserve support functions are provided to gaining commands, this item must be tabled. It would be an undue burden to the Fleet to support these various administrative Reserve functions.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further



consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-39-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 13-17/5420-99

**SUBJECT:** ALLOWING FIRST CLASS PETTY OFFICERS TO SERVE ON THE  
NATIONAL NAVAL RESERVE POLICY BOARD AND THE  
COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Robert H. Carey, Jr.  
NR ANZIO CG68 DET 6805  
NAVMARCORESCEN Akron  
(H) (202) 737-4949; (W) (202) 224-5325

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Many of the issues discussed at the Policy Boards directly affect E1 to E6 personnel. Issues such as quality of life, availability of Reserve component personnel for short-fused and/or extended peacetime contributory support operations, "deck plate" perception of Reserve component personnel by the active component, training requirements of Reservists for better integration with the active component and impact of Reserve component policy changes on retention and advancement, are all issues that are often delegated to leading petty officers, usually first class petty officers. Furthermore, the first class petty officer is often times the first level within a command possessing the authority to take independent action regarding personnel and may therefore handle many problems that will not make it up to the CPO or junior officers.

Not having E6s serving on the Policy Boards denies the Board this valuable knowledge. It also denies higher ranking personnel on the Board, who in the Reserve component may serve longer in these ranks before retiring, the insight of what policy changes will and will not work when they are attempted to be executed on the deck plates. A first class petty officer possesses the intimate knowledge of the life of the troops, combined with the first effective layer of autonomous authority in many cases.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Place at least one, preferably two, first class petty officers on the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Robert H. Carey, Jr.  
NR ANZIO CG68 DET 6805  
NAVMARCORESCEN Akron

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Our E6 Sailors possess a unique perspective on drill deck issues which are frequently different from that of the CPO community.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 13-17/5420-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend COMNAVRESFORINST 5420.5G be revised to include at least one (non-CPO selected) E6 as a member of the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board. Recommend SECNAVINST 5420.170H be revised to include at least one (non-CPO selected) E6 as a member of the National Naval Reserve Policy Board.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** COMNAVRESFORINST 5420.5G establishes the procedures and policies for the Naval Reserve Policy Board. Board composition includes five enlisted members including the COMNAVRESFOR Force Master Chief and the Enlisted Naval Reservist of the Year, an E-6 meritoriously advanced to Chief Petty Officer by the CNO. It is the consensus of the Board that there is currently adequate and forceful enlisted representation on the Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-40-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-02/5450-99

**SUBJECT:** DESCRIPTION OF NAVAL RESERVE UNITS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CAPT Christopher P. Moriarty  
GVTU 0415G  
(212) 208-1511

CDR John J. Needham  
GVTU 0415G  
(215) 340-0773

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** There appears to be no publication, e-mail link or document, generally available to Naval Reservists that lists various information on all Naval Reserve units. A lack of this information makes it very difficult for Naval Reservists to plan their careers or make appropriate selections for command selection boards.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That COMNAVRESFOR develop a publication or web link that lists all Naval Reserve units by their full name, their home Reserve activity, a description of their gaining commands and billet structures and a description of their mission. This publication or web link should be updated at least annually.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CDR Cheryl L. Austin  
NAVRESCEN Fort Dix  
(609) 723-7160

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** This recommendation is highly endorsed. Currently, there is no centralized description of Reserve units available at the field level. A description of unit types/missions would be a valuable tool to echelon IV billet managers and assist them in making intelligent cross-assignments.

Information concerning Reserve unit types/missions should be easily accessible by program managers at COMNAVRESFOR, COMNAVSURFRESFOR and COMNAVAIRESFOR. A system where unit commanding officers could supplement unit descriptions would also be useful.

Coordinating unit description updates with the release of command/senior officer non-command billet applications would assist officers in making intelligent career management decisions.

Suggested publications outlets include the COMNAVRESFOR/

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-02/5450-99 (CONTINUED)

COMNAVSURFRESFOR/COMNAVAIRESFOR web pages and the COMNAVRESFOR directives computer CD.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. This listing would be a valuable asset and, while maybe not necessary, it is easily created and makes everyone=s job a little easier.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** All echelons are currently developing web pages, including individual units. These sites contain similar data to that requested in this issue. The Naval Reservist News' annual almanac also provides similar data. Due to the need to focus on other more immediate automation issues (i.e., Y2K, NSIPS, AUIC Visibility), it is the consensus of the Board that individual unit efforts to provide this information will suffice until such time as NAVRESFOR is completely web enabled.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-41-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 22-02/5510-99

**SUBJECT:** BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS FOR NAVAL RESERVE AFFILIATES

**SUBMITTED BY:** LT C. E. Newman  
NAVMARCORESCEN Sacramento  
(916) 387-7100

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Naval Reserve Recruiting policy, as described in COMNAVRESCUITCOMINST 1133.1C, does not require that a background investigation (whether an Entrance National Agency Check (ENTNAC) or a Police Record Check (PRC)) be completed on an applicant prior to enlistment. This policy holds even if the applicant is enlisting with no prior service as an Advanced Pay Grade (APG) directly into a rating which requires access to classified or restricted Privacy Act protected information.

The policy requires each applicant to have documentation of submission of ENTNAC, either automatic or manual, prior to reporting to active duty.≡ It is not required to actually have the results of the ENTNAC prior to enlistment. Typically, the Reserve center with which the member affiliates must initiate a security investigation after the member has joined a unit. As a result, an applicant could be enlisted into one of 40 ratings requiring access to classified materials, affiliate with a Reserve unit and proceed to work toward advancement, only to at a later date be informed that DONCAF has denied, or recommended against, the request for a security clearance. The member is then forced to apply for another rating. Worse yet, the investigation could reveal prior felonies, or other serious and unfavorable information, indicating the member is unsuitable for service and was at the time of enlistment.

With respect to the PRC, the policy requires only that the PRC request be SENT to civil authorities before enlistment/affiliation. In fact, the DD Form 1966 specifically is to state that Applicant enlisted/shipped (YY/MM/DD) without waiting for response.≡ If the results of the PRC later reveal involvement in activities that, if known prior to enlistment, would have deemed the member ineligible for enlistment, the recruiter is to inform the parent activity for processing the member out of the Navy as appropriate. But, even as After the fact≡ as this may be, such notification to the parent activity is not common, based upon the fact that PRCs are often not even conducted. OMNAVRESCUITCOMINST 1133.1C states that APRCs are not required from those jurisdictions that require a fee or fingerprints, or from those jurisdictions that will not release the information.≡ Without

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 22-02/5510-99 (CONTINUED)

funding to pay the fee for a PRC, the recruiters must forgo even the initiating of a request for a PRC on a candidate.

There are a number of negative results of this overall policy:

1. The Navy wastes time and money that was invested in a member who must Arestart progression for a different rating.
2. It is discouraging and confusing for a member who is already wearing a rating to be told that he/she must apply for a change of rating.
3. Time and money is wasted on a member who, after enlistment, must be processed out due to unsuitability to serve in the Navy based upon ENTNAC or PRC findings.
4. With no check to ensure the Navy is not enlisting persons with serious criminal/felony records, servicemembers are placed at risk as is the Navy as a whole.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Naval Reserve Recruiting policy should require that all applicants have a background investigation conducted on them prior to actual enlistment. At a minimum, this should involve a PRC. Recruiting commands should be provided funding to pay the PRC fees as needed. Any person being recruited directed to any rating requiring access to classified or other sensitive information should have a security investigation (ENTNAC) completed for the enlistment to determine full suitability for the rating.

**ACTION OFFICER:** YNC W. E. Hoyt  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Twenty-Two (N01A)  
(425) 304-3256

**NAVRESREDCOMREG TWENTY-TWO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** It is rather fundamental that no one should be enlisted or affiliated into the Naval Reserve before reasonable assurances can be made that the member has no significant negative history that will preclude full and total service. The active service has the luxury of several months of initial training to allow such checks to be made that the Reserve community does not.

Though it is out of the question to expect ENTNACs to be performed of new enlistees with no prior service or affiliates who have been out of service over two years, it is not too much to expect a complete PRC before the member is enlisted. Minimal

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 22-02/5510-99 (CONTINUED)

fees charged to complete PRCs by local and state jurisdictions seems to be money well spent if it prevents problems in the future. It also gives greater latitude to local unit and NRA COs in providing interim clearances while awaiting ENTNAC checks to be completed.

At a minimum, a successful PRC should be completed prior to the enlistment or affiliation of any non-prior service member or to prior service personnel who have been out of service greater than two years. NAVRESCUITCOM should be provided the additional funding to ensure that fees required to conduct PRCs can and will be covered.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG TWENTY-TWO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG TWENTY-TWO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Due to the extensive length of time it takes to process and authorize security clearances, it would be prohibitive to institute a policy restricting recruiting accessions into the Naval Reserve until a clearance is awarded. The current practice is uniform in both active component recruiting and Reserve recruiting. Clearly, access to classified information must be denied until a clearance is granted in both the Reserve and active component and recruiting matters must be monitored by the member's unit and NRA. Reservists should be aware that participation in the Naval Reserve will be subject to the results of background investigations.

COMNAVRESCUITCOMINST 1133.1C is specific regarding the responsibilities of both the recruiter and the applicant related to acknowledgment of past criminal activity. It is correct that costly PRCs are not required, yet must be documented by the recruiter. Recruiting costs impact overall DON funds and would become more costly by adding additional requirements. For example, an applicant would require three PRCs, one for location, school, and job. In today's society, Reservists often live and work in numerous locations, all of which would necessitate three PRCs to be executed. The timeliness of a law enforcement agency's completion of a PRC varies widely and is beyond the control of recruiters. Based on the current number of new accessions required, PRCs would, therefore, be a burdensome expense and could be detrimental to mission accomplishment.



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 22-02/5510-99 (CONTINUED)

A NAVPERS 1070/613 (Page 13), in the form of a statement of understanding, could be a solution. The Page 13 would document the applicant's appraisal of the potential consequences if adverse information is discovered. This would resolve some of the concerns mentioned in the policy issue submitted. The time and expense of such processing, after the fact, is minimal in comparison to the time and expense of investigations prior to accession.

Recruiters are responsible for the preparation of ENTNACs and NACs and for providing personal data on the PRC, but MEPS have the responsibility of submitting the PRC in conjunction with the enlistment process. Naval Reserve recruiting policy similarly charges the recruiter with preparation and review of the forms and leaves it up to a NRA to submit the investigation. Checks with several NRAs indicated that not all NRAs submit the investigative forms, if a clearance is not required.

Effective 1 January 1999, the investigative standards for access to national security information was enhanced to add local agency checks (PRCs) and credit checks to the investigations (ENTNAC/NAC) traditionally conducted to support these determinations. With the onset of this new requirement, investigations, including a PRC, will be conducted on those individuals requiring access to classified material, albeit after the fact of accession. For those individuals not requiring access to classified material, procedures should be established to ensure NRAs submit ENTNACs for new accessions to establish suitability.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-42-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-08/6000-99

**SUBJECT:** PARAMEDIC NAVY ENLISTED CLASSIFICATION (NEC)

**SUBMITTED BY:** HM1 Walls  
NR NAVHOSP Jacksonville 108  
NAVMARCORESCEN West Palm Beach  
(561) 687-3954

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** The paramedic NEC was dropped several years ago due to the Navy=s stronger emphasis on civilian contract personnel to provide medical support. Despite the use of civilian contractors, changes in hospital unit requirements are finding paramedics being used more heavily in emergency room situations. Paramedics now man emergency vehicles for hospital units. The lack of an NEC is an issue of maintaining credentials, continuing education and the ability to provide support to those locations unable to function or continue as a medical facility without their support. An example of the role paramedics play in the operation of base medical facilities is a recent AT at Naval Station Key West. The base medical facilities would have had to restrict or modify its hours of operation because it lacked a paramedic to cover some of the ambulance and emergency room requirements.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Changing requirements for hospital units find the role of paramedics taking on more significance. As a result, there is a need to identify specific billet requirements that are critical parts of the unit=s mission. There is a strong need for reinstatement of the paramedic NEC.

**NAVMARCORESCEN WEST PALM BEACH DISCUSSION:** Medical commands already have the means to request or require particular NECs for the billets they manage. The schooling required for qualification as a paramedic is extensive and it would not be practical for SELRES personnel to attain the NEC. For SELRES HMs who already have civilian qualification as a paramedic, it might be beneficial to identify that qualification via a NEC, however, the Navy would then assume the financial burden involved in periodic recertification.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Candace L. Palmer  
NAVRESCEN St. Petersburg  
(813) 531-7033

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 08-08/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The focus of the mission of hospital units needs to be reevaluated. In the past, the focus of emergency medical care has been toward using civilian contract personnel. If the focus has changed toward the use of Navy personnel, then the reestablishment of the paramedic NEC may need to be further addressed.

SELRES who hold the Civilian Occupation Code as credentialed paramedics should be recognized with the appropriate NEC so that they can be appropriately identified and utilized. SELRES who are civilian paramedics will maintain their continuing education needs and credentials to maintain their civilian occupations. If the individual fails to maintain certification as a paramedic, the NEC would be withdrawn. Using REFLEX IDT options would assist SELRES in maintaining continuing education needs.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with recommendation. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for further review.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG EIGHT RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the above recommendation. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The active component establishes Reserve component manning requirements. In the early 1990s, the active component determined there was no wartime requirement for Navy Paramedics. Further, the skills maintenance and proficiency training required would be difficult to attain and maintain within the Naval Reserve because of the length of the qualification period.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-43-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 13-16/6000-99

**SUBJECT:** MEDICAL CREDENTIAL VERIFICATION PROCESS

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR P. Phillips  
NR Fleet Hospital 9  
NAVMARCORESCEN Columbus  
(614) 644-0692

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Medical personnel discharged from active duty and affiliating with the Naval Reserve must be recredentialed through the Health Care Support Office (HSO) Jacksonville. This results in delays or disapproval of member requests for AT or ADSW orders. The consensus is that if the member was adequately credentialed on active duty, then why must they be totally recredentialed upon affiliation with Reserve units? This unit had two Medical Corps officers affiliating from active duty who have had difficulty with AT orders because they lacked credentialing through HSO Jacksonville. This problem stems from a disparity in how the active duty side and the Reserve side credential their medical personnel. Each active duty command is responsible for credentialing their members and forwarding those credentials on as the member is transferred to a new command. None of the information is handled in HSO Jacksonville so the member is "not credentialed." The active duty side does not brief the member about these problems upon discharge and the Reserve side may fail to notify the new member of the process when affiliating.

**RECOMMENDATION:** All credentialing records, for both active duty and Reserve, should be forwarded to HSO Jacksonville. Active duty commands can continue to credential their personnel, but the credentials must be copied to Jacksonville and be kept in the members file. Upon discharge, the member would then have a current file and many difficulties would cease. Educating the active duty side upon discharge in the Reserve credentialing process would also alleviate many of these problems and would enlighten new members upon affiliation with a Reserve unit. When giving Reserve indoctrination, the Reserve activity medical department representative could also include this important item in their program. Reinforcement of this process could then also come from the Reserve unit to which the member is affiliating.

This premise takes into consideration that HSO Jacksonville is currently experiencing extreme difficulties in remaining current with the Reserve credentialing process. It is hoped that the entire program at HSO Jacksonville will be looked at (preferably from an outside civilian source) and examined for recommendations

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 13-16/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

to improve and streamline their process. Military medicine has taken many hits recently by having questionable doctors rendering care at active duty commands. The lack of centralized records usually results in a practitioners ability to withhold pertinent information from his credentialing submission. If the provider happens to be sanctioned by one states medical board and licensed in another state, then he/she could conceivably omit that information from their submission to the active duty command credentialing staff and be wrongfully credentialed in the military.

A centralized credentialing process should be used for accessing the National Physician's Data Bank and the internet site for all state medical board web pages prior to approval of practitioner.

**ACTION OFFICER:** LCDR Patricia A. Phillips  
NR Fleet Hospital 9  
NAVMARCORESCEN Columbus  
(614) 235-2630

**NAVMARCORESCEN COLUMBUS POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** HMC Keith Michaud, of the Centralized Credentialing Office, HSO Jacksonville, confirmed that the problem identified by LCDR Phillips is true. The medical credentials recognized while on active duty do not follow the member into the Reserve community so recredentialing is necessary. This process is time-consuming and typically prevents recently affiliated members from performing AT until their credentials have been verified.

**NAVMARCORESCEN COLUMBUS POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with LCDR Phillips' recommendations. Credentials should not expire when the member leaves active duty. If credentials are withdrawn by a state, that agency should notify HSO Jacksonville to update the files. If a member is released from active duty or is discharged in good standing, their credentials should remain in tact. As discussed with HMC Michaud, change the credentialing policy, in which credentials could be fixed in the member's service record and could follow the member to the new destination. Then, during those two years, the member could complete the recredentialing process at the new command.

Further, concur with LCDR Phillips' insight and recommendations to investigate a complete overhaul of this process to improve and develop an efficient centralized credentialing program.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 13-16/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** It is not desirable or necessary for active duty credential records to be duplicated or maintained by more than one activity.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, with modifications. The submitting officer's recommendation to forward copies of active duty member credential records while still on active duty to HSO Jacksonville is not recommended by REDCOM 13.

However, there is no standardized process to transfer active duty credential records to the Naval Reserve for use upon a member's affiliation with the Reserve.

The requirement to reinitiate the credential verification process upon affiliation appears inefficient for both the Naval Reserve and the member. It is recommended a process be established to receive and use active duty credential records instead of requiring HSO Jacksonville to recreate the records.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG THIRTEEN RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The Board recognizes there is no automatic process to transfer active duty credential records upon affiliation to the Naval Reserve. However, a standardized process does exist to obtain, enter and maintain credential information to ensure proper credentialing.

HSO Jacksonville actively coordinates with Recruiting and Medical Training Facility (MTF)/Dental Training Facility (DTF) commands to ensure health care providers are credentialed in a timely manner.

BUMEDINST 6320.66B provides guidance for submission, responsibility, and management of credentials and privileges.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-44-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 22-01/6000-99

**SUBJECT:** ELIGIBLE NAVAL RESERVISTS ACCESSING MEDICAL CARE

**SUBMITTED BY:** HM1 Clare Markley  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Twenty-Two (N91A)  
(425) 304-3870

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Prior to the implementation of the TRICARE system, it was fairly simple for a Naval Reservist on IDT, IDTT, ADT or AT to access necessary medical care for routine directed physicals, emergency or acute medical issues and Notice of Eligibility (NOE) follow-up appointments. A medical department representative (MDR) would merely directly liaison with the local military treatment facility (MTF)/clinic appointment desk, or submit a consult for specialty care.

With the advent of TRICARE and the appointment processes demanded by this system, it has become increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to arrange for medical care for eligible Naval Reserve personnel. The TRICARE Regional Appointment Center (TRAC) is only able and willing to make appointments for personnel reflected as eligible in the DEERS/RAPIDS system, which does not include Naval Reservists not on extended active duty orders.

Currently, Naval Reservists' appointments are made by the member's MDR who must call around to an MTF/clinic until they are able to contact someone willing to authorize the required care. Unfortunately, more and more MTF/clinic personnel are hesitant to circumvent the DEERS/RAPIDS eligibility notation despite the true eligibility of the Naval Reserve member. This hesitancy may be rooted in budgetary issues, as MTF/clinics find themselves funded to TRICARE Prime enrollment statistics upon full implementation of enrollment-based capitation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** A simplified, routine process allowing for swift access to medical care for eligible Naval Reservists who are in an IDT, IDTT, ADT or AT status is vital. Some specific suggestions include:

1. Create a code in DEERS/RAPIDS which identifies a Reservist as eligible for care in certain instances.
2. Create an eligibility card, similar to a commissary card, issued to a Reservist for specific time periods (i.e., AT, IDTT) or for a specific appointment (i.e., NOE follow-up, physical

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 22-01/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

exam). It would be dated and signed by the NRA CO, MDR, Reserve liaison or other authorized person.

**ACTION OFFICER:** HMC V. E. Beers  
NAVRESREDCOMREG Twenty-Two (N9)  
(425) 304-3870

**NAVRESREDCOMREG TWENTY-TWO POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The TRICARE systems inflexibility for making appointments is renowned. Understandably, the TRAC personnel can use only that information available to them to determine eligibility in making appointments. Their primary means is through the information placed into the DEERS/RAPIDS system. Though, it is recognized that MTF/clinics would always provide emergency care as needed, the larger issue of routine matters such as physicals and NOE follow-ups, or the periodic acute medical (non-emergent) issues needs to be addressed.

A separate code in the DEERS/RAPIDS system reflecting a Naval Reservist as Asituationally eligible would be an ideal solution to get the TRAC to make the initial appointment with the MTF. But the appointment must then also be coded with the caveat that services are not to be rendered until the Naval Reserve member presents an authorizing letter from his/her NRA or active duty gaining command for that specific instance.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG TWENTY-TWO POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board for consideration.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG TWENTY-TWO RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Policy Board recommendation.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** NMTFs provide medical service in support of the Naval Reserve as space allows. Services to TRICARE enrollees, as verified through DEERS, are first priority.

Cooperation between the MDR and a designated point of contact at an MTF can facilitate scheduled visits for appropriate purposes through the computerized healthcare system.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.



**ITEM:** III-45-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** CNARF-01/6000-99

**SUBJECT:** TRICARE SELECTED RESERVE DENTAL PROGRAM BENEFITS FOR  
VOLUNTARY TRAINING UNIT (VTU) MEMBERS

**SUBMITTED BY:** PNCM Robert Schuck  
NAVAIRES San Diego  
(619) 545-2649; DSN 735-2649

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Currently, the TRICARE Selected Reserve Dental Program (TSRDP) is offered to Reservists from all branches of the Uniformed Services, but is not offered to members assigned to a Voluntary Training Unit (VTU). If you have at least one year of service commitment remaining and are serving in the Reserve, you are eligible to enroll. Monthly premiums are automatically withheld from monthly drill pay. Coverage remains available as long as you maintain your Reserve status and you are shown as eligible on your DEERS record.

The DOD established this benefit to ensure the dental health of Reservists and Guardsmen does not interfere with their mission-ready status or the government=s ability to deploy troops. Military Reservists who elect to enroll in the dental program receive select diagnostic, routine, restorative, oral surgery and emergency dental service as determined by the DOD.

Our VTU personnel make many significant contributions to our program. Many of our VTU personnel are currently TAD to Reserve units on drill weekends, providing contributory support without pay. Some officers and enlisted members are assessed into the Reserve program via the VTU and later assigned to pay billets. While in the VTU, some personnel go on ADT orders to priority exercises when their skills are needed and funds are available, again demonstrating their relevance to the success of our program and as vital members of our Total Force. Offering insurance to VTU personnel is not a new concept. VTU personnel can currently elect to participate in the Serviceman=s Group Life Insurance (SGLI) program, but do not have the option of the new dental plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** VTU personnel should have the option of participating in the new SELRES dental plan. Payment would be made by personal check or money order (the same way they currently pay premiums for SGLI).

**ACTION OFFICER:** HMCS(SW) Matthew Staden  
COMNAVAIRESFOR Flight Medical Programs (N3M)  
(504) 678-6309; DSN 678-6309

ORIGINATOR NUMBER: CNARF-01/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

COMNAVAIRESFOR FLIGHT MEDICAL PROGRAMS DISCUSSION: The TSRDP is offered to SELRES personnel in the Naval Reserve. At this time, however, VTU members are not offered this service, but are still required to meet all physical standards as set forth by the Manual of the Medical Department, P-117, chapter 15, including five-year physical examinations with dental examinations.

Since the dental requirement changed from annually to once every five years, there has been an increase in the number of SELRES being placed in a class 3 dental readiness category. This has resulted in placing a number of SELRES personnel in a Not Physically Qualified (NPQ) status due to their dental readiness, including members of the VTU. Also, the frequency of Reserve dental examinations will be changing again in FY-99 from five years back to annually. This will drive the dental readiness level down even more. There is also discussion to use civilian dentists under TSRDP to complete the annual dental screening which will increase dental readiness.

At present, Naval Reserve end strength for dental officers is at 100 percent, however, often geographic location of dental officers are not conducive to conducting dental exams. Some locations may have 2-3 dental officers and other none. Again, this problem can be solved with the use of civilian dentists completing dental exams. As of 1 August 1998, there are 2,897 officers and 1,137 enlisted members in VTUs in the Naval Reserve. These personnel still must maintain the same medical/dental/PRT readiness as their SELRES counterparts.

Mr. Michael Payne of Humana Health Care, TRICARE Dental Division, (800) 221-3614, states that each SELRES pays \$4.36 for dental care with the DOD paying a \$6.54 cost share. In discussion, it was stated that he saw no problem with the VTU member paying the full \$11.00 cost share to receive the same benefit. At this time, only 24 percent of the SELRES community is taking advantage of this dental program.

When asking COMNAVRESFOR Force Medical why VTU personnel are not eligible for the dental program, they stated that it was because of their non-pay status under BUPERSINST 1001.39C. This reference states that VTU personnel are not allowed pay or benefits. After extensive research, it was found that VTU members can participate in the SGLI program. The SGLI office in Cleveland, Ohio states that VTU personnel pay their SGLI in quarterly payments. This same method of pay for service could be used to provide dental care.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** CNARF-01/6000-99 (CONTINUED)

**COMNAVAIRESFOR FLIGHT MEDICAL PROGRAMS RECOMMENDATION:** VTU personnel should have the option of participating in the TSRDP. If their non-pay status is the issue, have the VTU member pay the full price of \$22 quarterly or \$133 in annual payment. This will increase the dental readiness of VTU personnel and place them on a level playing field with their SELRES counterparts.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Fiscal year 2001 legislation initiatives for the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) include a proposal to consolidate the dependent and Reserve dental programs and expand the Reserve dental program by amending Title 10, US Code, Section 1076a. This proposal would also extend eligibility in the current Selected Reserve Dental Program to include those members of the Inactive Ready Reserve who are subject to involuntary call-up under the provisions of Title 10, US Code, Section 12304 (Presidential Selected Reserve Call-up) authority.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-46-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** FL-01/6000-99

**SUBJECT:** DENTAL CARE (NO BENEFITS)

**SUBMITTED BY:** AKCS Diane Mathischar  
NR NAS Jacksonville  
NAVAIRES Jacksonville  
DSN 942-3320, ext 130

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Reservists are given dental exams on drill weekends, but not routine dental care despite the fact they have enrolled in the Navy TRICARE Selected Reserve Dental Program.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Expand the Navy TRICARE Selected Reserve Dental Program to include Navy dentists. If a Reservist uses a Navy dentist, the Navy TRICARE Selected Reserve Dental Program would reimburse the Navy for services provided.

**ACTION OFFICER:** CAPT Jim Love  
NAVAIRES Jacksonville  
DSN 942-3320, ext 130

**NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** At present, dental exams are provided only to determine individual readiness. If Navy dentists were included in the TRICARE Selected Reserve Dental Program, the funds paid for this service could be used to improve the overall Navy Dental Program, providing for more technicians and equipment.

**NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward to higher authority for consideration. Recommend that DOD include Navy dentists as part of the Selected Reserve Dental Program to be reimbursed by the Navy TRICARE Selected Reserve Dental Program.

**CO, NAVAIRES JACKSONVILLE RECOMMENDATION:** Concur. Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Naval Reservists enrolled in TRICARE Selected Reserve Dental Program may receive dental care from any dentist designated as an authorized provider. Dental examinations performed by military dental clinics are limited to those necessary to ascertain mobilization readiness. Restorative procedures are a personal convenience to the Reservist and are not an appropriate use of drill time.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.



**ITEM:** III-47-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 01-09/6120-99

**SUBJECT:** PHYSICALS

**SUBMITTED BY:** CDR John H. Booth  
NAVRESREDCOMREG One  
(401) 841-2455

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Current Navy-wide guidance requires a "long form" physical within 18 months of coming on ADSW and one within 90 days of detaching from ADSW. These requirements are excessive. All other Reserve components require personnel performing ADSW to meet standard DOD requirements of physicals within five years. Only those leaving ADSW or TTAD and not returning to a drill status require a release from active duty physical. These Navy physical requirements increase cost and cause delays in bringing Reservists on ADSW. With the draw down of medical assets it seems logical to reduce unnecessary administrative requirements to increase efficiency and decrease costs. Physical exam requirements should mirror active duty requirements and not be in excess of them.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Change Navy requirements for physical exams to the DOD standard of every five years. Do not create a special requirement for Reservists coming on ADSW to have an exam within 18 months or if immediately returning to drill status a release from active duty exam within 90 days.

**ACTION OFFICER:** DPC L. J. Farak  
NAVRESREDCOMREG ONE  
(401) 841-4085

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ONE POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** Navy requirements (BUMED) for physical exams already meet the DOD standard of every 5 years and do not have to be changed. These requirements pertain to both the active duty and Reserve members. The special requirement for Reservists to have a Along form physical within 18 months of starting an ADSW and one upon discharge, if the ADSW is longer than 90 days, is a BUPERS requirement and is justified. Reservists are not authorized to use a Military Treatment Facility (MTF) and therefore their medical records are not available for review like the record of an active duty member. A medical condition that occurs while the member is not on active duty is normally not recorded in that member's medical record. The question of increased costs associated with these physicals does not offset the cost of the Navy having to provide long term or lifetime medical care for an illness or disease that had been diagnosed and known to the member prior to active duty. In

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 01-09/6120-99 (CONTINUED)

regards to these physicals causing delays in a Reservist going on ADSW, a Reservist normally has advance notice for reporting due to the fact that they have volunteered for the specific ADSW and there is ample time to obtain a physical (if needed) prior to receiving orders. In any case, if the ADSW is under the auspices of a TYCOM, the TYCOMs physical requirements take precedence over either BUMED or BUPERS requirements and are generally more strict. It was noted that active duty personnel are also required to have additional physicals prior to reporting to certain foreign and/or remote sites (i.e., Operation Deep Freeze physicals) for specific duties or when being transferred to specific overseas locations.

**NAVRESREDCOMREG ONE POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of the issue is not recommended.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG ONE RECOMMENDATION:** Do not concur with Policy Board discussion and recommendation. Recommend further study and consideration of this issue. Responsiveness and possible cost savings would appear to be significant. Additional empirical study is needed to determine if the benefits of conducting physical examinations within 18 months of commencing ADSW outweigh their deleterious affect on morale and our ability to rapidly activate Reserve personnel.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** A revision to OPNAVINST 1001.2A is nearing completion. The draft version recommends that the requirements for physical examinations be aligned with the requirements for active duty and that physical examinations upon release will be required for periods of active duty in excess of 90 days.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-48-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-05/6230-99

**SUBJECT:** FISCAL SHORTFALLS FOR FUNDING FOR MEDICAL SUPPLIES

**SUBMITTED BY:** HMC Shelley Dunn  
NAVAIRES Whidbey Island  
360) 257-9805

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Many Reserve activities are not co-located with Military Treatment Facilities (MTFs), and therefore, SELRES cannot obtain the immunizations required by BUMEDNOTE 6230, NAVMEDCOMINST 6230.3 AND COMNAVRESFORINST 6230.1B. With regard to immunization purchases, the Navy Comptroller Manual states: At the Cost Account Codes (CACs) prescribed herein will be used at the level of detail prescribed by the Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Because COMNAVRESFOR is not mission funded or authorized to purchase immunizations for remote sites (those not located near a MTF), they are either inappropriately purchasing immunizations on a reimbursable basis or going through Aback doors (beg, borrow, steal) to get the immunizations required to meet the medical readiness of their assigned personnel.

**RECOMMENDATION:** BUMED should either send **all** required vaccines to these units (like they currently do for flu and hepatitis-a vaccines) or provide specific cost-accounting code/funding to each site; or,

Expand existing MOUs and contracts with non-MTFs to include immunizations; or,

Give Reserve Comptrollers authority and funding to purchase immunizations.

**ACTION OFFICER:** HMC Shelley Dunn

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** The board agreed that this would be a relatively inexpensive means of ensuring a high degree of medical support, especially at sites that are not collocated with MTF=s.

**NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forward this discussion item to COMNAVRESFOR for consideration.

**CO, NAVAIRES WHIDBEY ISLAND RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the Board=s recommendation.



**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** WA-05/6230-99 (CONTINUED)

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** BUMED 201740Z Nov 98 reiterates the policy that Navy and Marine Corps personnel are eligible to receive immunizations at no cost at Naval Medical Treatment Facilities (NMTF). Required immunizations are routinely provided at NMTFs while members are performing Annual Training (AT), Active Duty Training (ADT), Inactive Duty Training (IDT), Inactive Duty Training Travel (IDTT), Active Duty for Special Work (ADSW) or Presidential Selected Reserve Call-up (PSRC).

The message referenced also encourages alternate methods to complete immunizations at remote Reserve Centers through arrangements determined by the NMTF and Naval Reserve Activity (NRA) Commanding Officers.

For units alerted for activation, BUMED may provide direct funding to the nearest MTF by specific letter authorization.

Managed immunization programs (i.e., Anthrax and Hepatitis A) conducted on a requisition dose basis are centrally funded by BUMED.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

**ITEM:** III-49-99

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-04/7220-99

**SUBJECT:** HOUSING ALLOWANCE FOR SINGLE RESERVISTS

**SUBMITTED BY:** LCDR Michael Goldschmidt  
XO, NAVRESCEN Fort Dix (N01)  
(609) 723-7160, ext 102

**PROBLEM/DISCUSSION:** Married officers and enlisted of both active and inactive components receive Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) at the "with dependents" rate anytime they are executing orders. This is, presumably, because they have costs associated with civilian-sector quarters, regardless of whether they are ashore or afloat. Single personnel of the active forces are entitled to BAH at the single rate in order to maintain housing in the civilian sector unless their primary residence is in government quarters ashore. Single members of the Selected Reserve, however, regardless of their need to keep civilian quarters in support of their civilian sector lives while on AT, are denied BAH at the single rate if they are living in government quarters or afloat. They have similar needs to their full time and married counterparts, but are denied similar compensation. This is an "equal pay for equal work" issue. The need for a member to have civilian quarters does not go away merely because he/she performs AT.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Single members of the Naval Reserve on AT be entitled to BAH at the single rate, regardless of where they are housed during their period of AT.

**ACTION OFFICER:** PN1 Alex Gubanyi  
NAVRESCEN Fort Dix  
(609) 723-7160, ext 114

**NAVRESCEN FORT DIX POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Concur with the above recommendation.

**ACTION OFFICER:** DCC(SW) Nicholas J. Ahart  
NAVMARCORESCEN Brooklyn  
(718) 258-0258

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** All Reservists should be entitled to all pay and allowances that an active duty member is entitled to receive. If, for example, an E5 single active duty members is allowed to draw single BAH while stationed on board a ship, then a SELRES E5 on AT should also be entitled to that pay.

**ORIGINATOR NUMBER:** 04-04/7220-99 (CONTINUED)

**NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Forwarded, recommending approval.

**COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION:** Concur.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION:** For members of the National Guard, the Air National Guard, or any Uniform Services Reserve component on Active Duty for Training (ADT), the location of the training duty is considered to be the "permanent station" for BAH entitlement purposes. Therefore, under current law, Reservists are being treated equally with their active duty counterpart.

The consensus of the Board is that the financial impact of a major change to the definition of "permanent station" for housing purposes cannot be supported at this time.

**1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION:** Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

ITEM: III-50-99

ORIGINATOR NUMBER: 04-10/1320-99

SUBJECT: BILLET REQUISITION SYSTEM (BRS)

SUBMITTED BY: YN1 William E. Goin  
NAVMARCORESCEN Harrisburg  
(717) 255-8070

PROBLEM/DISCUSSION: Assigning Naval Reservists locally simplifies training and improves morale. Unfortunately, billets and Reservists are often not co-located.

Cross-assignments are volatile. Reservists can shift billets, units and gaining commands six or more times in less than one year. This makes scheduling training difficult as requirements are continually in flux. Also, no bond between individual Reservists and their gaining command can develop. Reservists who are IAP are even more problematic. There is no gaining command to gain to and morale is lowered by the continual fear of involuntary transfer to non-pay due to IAP status.

The BRS allowed echelon IV and higher billet managers to move vacant billets to IAP Reservists. A billet manager would enter the SSN of an IAP Naval Reservist and RTSS would search for vacant billets. If a billet was found in a unit similar to a unit at the Reservist's NRA, RTSS would move the vacant billet to the activity and a local assignment would be created. This increased the number of local assignments with positive effects on morale and training effectiveness. BRS rewarded commands that aggressively sought to lower IAP rates and penalized NRAs/NAVRESREDCOMs that failed to make appropriate billet assignments.

There were some flaws with the BRS, but they were being worked on when BRS was deactivated in November 1997. The appropriate solution was to improve and modify the BRS, not deactivate it.

RECOMMENDATION: Restore the BRS in RTSS. Actively canvass Echelon IV Nls (manpower) for improvements and implement upgrades to the system as quickly as practicable.

ACTION OFFICER: CDR Cheryl L. Austin  
NAVRESCEN Fort Dix  
(609) 724-7160

ORIGINATOR NUMBER: 04-10/1320-99 (CONTINUED)

NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION: This would improve morale and readiness and reduce our IAP rate. Reactivate the BRS for a period of one year, during which time unit/NRA/NAVRESREDCOM concerns would be addressed and resolved. COMNAVRESFOR would appoint a committee to convene at the end of the trial period to assess the desirability of continued BRS use.

NAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION: Forward to the COMNAVRESFOR Policy Board.

COMNAVRESREDCOMREG FOUR RECOMMENDATION: Concur. Current billet management is too far removed from the end-user (the Reserve unit). Reactivating BRS will improve our readiness and local manning levels.

1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD DISCUSSION: AUIC Visibility will provide for force shaping and unit placement closer to the gaining commands. These initiatives are designed to identify billets which resource sponsors have selected for funding and will make the Naval Reserve more responsive to gaining commands. The AUIC Visibility initiative is a tool that will be used to reshape the Naval Reserve to better meet Fleet support requirements. Reviving the BRS would have a counterproductive effect on the AUIC Visibility initiative, in that it would move the billet to the Selected Reservist, away from the gaining command, instead of seeking to recruit the right Reservist into a billet where he/she would be more closely located to the active unit.

1999 COMNAVRESFOR POLICY BOARD RECOMMENDATION: Further consideration of this item is not recommended.

COMMANDER, NAVAL RESERVE FORCE POSITION: No further action.

## 1999 MID-YEAR REVIEW OF OUTSTANDING POLICY ITEMS

### 1996 ITEMS (1)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-8-96	INFORMATION COLLECTION REDUNDANCY	OPEN

Plans call for a new web-based skills civilian skills database. Since the new system is not yet up and running, COMNAVRESFOR N1 should continue to monitor this item.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

### 1997 ITEMS (2)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
I-8-97	DD-214 ADDITIONS	OPEN

A memorandum was sent to DOD Personnel Management (PM), Legal Division with NPC-814s recommendation to incorporate a change to the instruction to include advancement examination participation information on the DD-214. DOD PM has not made a decision as to approving these changes to the instruction. COMNAVRESFOR N01A will monitor the status.

COMNAVRESFOR N01A will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-13-97	PHYSICAL READINESS TEST (PRT) PROGRAM AND HEIGHT/WEIGHT MEASUREMENT TIME LINES	OPEN
----------	---	------

OPNAVINST 6110.1 (series) is currently in OPNAV staffing and the anticipated release date has not been determined. Without the new directive guidelines, this item cannot be addressed.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

### 1998 ITEMS (8)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-1-98	SEABEE ORDERS	OPEN

NAVFAC is convening a working group to identify possible short-term improvements to Seabee order writing. Although there have been two Memorandum's of Understanding (MOUs) already signed between COMNAVSURFRESFOR and NAVFAC, there is another MOU awaiting signature which will fine-tune some of the current methods that are in place. COMNAVSURFRESFOR N37 will monitor the progress of this item.

COMNAVSURFRESFOR N3 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-2-98	VOLUNTARY TRAINING UNIT (VTU) PROGRAM	OPEN

Although COMNAVSURFRESFOR has established a VTU Program Manager staff position to oversee the VTU program, no policy guidance has been implemented by COMNAVRESFOR for the program.

This item must be referred to COMNAVRESFOR N1 to provide such policy guidance and to support and be an advocate for our VTU members.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-8-98	PROFESSIONAL MILITARY TRAINING (PMT)	CLOSED
---------	--------------------------------------	--------

This item has been resolved with the newly released revision to COMNAVAIRESFORINST 1500.5 (series).

II-9-98	NON-TRADITIONAL DRILLS	OPEN
---------	------------------------	------

COMNAVRESFOR N1 continues to monitor the pilot program at NAS Atlanta. Policy changes will happen, but the question is how to employ it. The audit process and financial reporting means need to be considered, as there must be a tracking process and an audit trail.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-14-98	MANPOWER AVAILABILITY STATUS (MAS) CODES	OPEN
----------	--	------

COMNAVRESFOR N12 has assumed responsibility for MAS code maintenance. Working with both COMNAVRESFOR N3 and N5, an update to COMNAVRESFORINST 3060.7 (series) is in progress and will consolidate codes and establish an administrative prioritization.

A longer-term project includes the functional tie-in to the Navy Standard Integrated personnel System (NSIPS) and the Reserve Headquarters System (RHS) to ensure that coding and definitions are consistent across the board. Because NSIPS requirements for Releases 0 and 1 were previously set, the MAS coding update in the data systems will be delayed until Release 2, approximately 18 months after Release 1.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-17-98	U.S. ARMED FORCES COMMISSARY CARD, DD FORM 2529 (NOV 88)	OPEN
----------	--	------

The desire to automate this card is a functional Business Process from IT. COMNAVRESFOR N1 owns the Commissary Card process and should request automation from COMNAVRESFOR N6.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-18-98	COUNTRY/SECURITY CLEARANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR ANNUAL TRAINING (AT)	OPEN

The Foreign Clearance Guide will not be automated, but could be made part of the new Single Order Writing System. COMNAVRESFOR N3 owns that process and it should be made a part of the Business Process Review.

COMNAVRESFOR N3 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-21-98	STANDARDIZE ALL OFFICER/ENLISTED BOARD APPLICATIONS	OPEN
----------	---	------

There are inconsistencies between Surface and Air selection boards which equal a multitude of possibilities that standardization may impede the selection board process. COMNAVRESFOR N1 needs to evaluate both Surface and Air selection board requirements to determine if this information can be standardized.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

#### 1999 ITEMS (17)

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-1-99	REINSTITUTION OF THE OFFICIAL QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE (OQQ)	OPEN

The OQQ is not a "requirement" for application for membership on boards convened by COMNAVPERSCOM. Both COMNAVRESFOR and COMNAVRESFOR, which conducts command selection boards, does not require it. COMNAVRESFOR N12 is proposing the inclusion of a history of Reserve assignments on the new skills database.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-2-99	GAINING COMMANDERS AS REPORTING SENIORS ON UNIT LEVEL FITNESS REPORTS (FITREPs)	OPEN
---------	---	------

For all practical purposes, this is currently happening and will be addressed in Change 2 to COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5 (series).

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-3-99	WORK AT HOME - DRILLS PERFORMED AT HOME OR LOCAL RESERVE SITE	OPEN
---------	---	------

COMNAVRESFOR N1 continues to monitor the pilot program at NAS Atlanta. Policy changes will happen, but the question is how to employ it. The audit process and financial reporting means need to be considered, as there must be a tracking process and an audit trail.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.



<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-4-99	UNIFORMS FOR EXERCISES	OPEN

This item is revised to a Category I item and will be forwarded to SECNAVs National Naval Reserve Policy Board for consideration.

The COMNAVRESFOR policy for issuance of Combat Utility Uniforms complicated things for SELRES desiring to participate in various exercises, particularly when the command sponsoring the exercise cannot or will not bear the cost of issue and maintenance for the organizational gear prescribed. The policy is based on instructions and U.S. Navy Uniform Regulations and must be changed at higher authority.

II-5-99	UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR E6 AND BELOW	OPEN
---------	------------------------------------	------

This issue is being worked by CNO N1. The change to an allowance vice one-for-one turn in/issue is considered an allowance/entitlement and must be changed through legislation.

COMNAVRESFOR N4 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-6-99	ADVANCED PAY GRADE (APG)/ACCELERATED INITIAL ACCESSION (AIA) PROGRAM	CLOSED
---------	---	--------

This is now a year-round course at RTC Great Lakes and the backlog can be handled with people moving through. Individuals are now being recruited to specific class dates. 27 April 2000 will be the first "official" class at RTC.

II-7-99	APG SWIM QUALIFICATIONS	OPEN
---------	-------------------------	------

Per MILPERSMAN 1414010, for individuals who fail to qualify for Swimmer Fourth Class, a NAVPERS 1070/613 (page 13) should be prepared stating "Member agrees to seek additional swimming instructions and will not be eligible for Class "A" or "C" school, apprentice training, extension of enlistment, reenlistment or assignment to an afloat command until qualification as Swimmer Fourth Class."

COMNAVRESFOR 221202Z Jan 99 specifically states that non-swimmers will be permitted to complete the 2-week APG course. This policy will remain in effect until CNO has promulgated a change to the current accession swim requirements. The current swim policy is under review and the results should be available by the end of the year.

The forthcoming relocation of the APG/AIA program to RTC Great Lakes will enable staff members the opportunity during the training cycle to offer remedial swimming for personnel who fail to qualify for Swimmer Fourth Class. This should help alleviate the number of swim failures during accession level training. COMNAVRESFOR N7 will continue to pursue this item and promulgate any required changes upon completion of the review process.

COMNAVRESFOR N7 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-8-99	STREAMLINING RESCHEDULED DRILL ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS	OPEN

COMNAVRESFOR N1 is staffing changes to COMNAVRESFORINST 1001.5 (series), which are to include reductions in administrative requirements to drill scheduled and reporting. Both COMNAVAIRESFOR and COMNAVSURFRESFOR N1s are part of this review process.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-9-99	ACTIVE DUTY FOR SPECIAL (ADSW) PROCESSING	OPEN
---------	---	------

CNO N1 controls this process. There is a new instruction pending at CNO N13. The timetable for release is 30-45 days with a plan to get it out by mid-November. A NAVADMIN message draft is ready to be released if the instruction issuance drags on. This new instruction will also include a detailed checklist.

COMNAVRESFOR N3 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-10-99	TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SELRES	OPEN
----------	--------------------------------	------

COMNAVRESFOR is collecting the information systems requirements to develop a new SELRES order writing system, tentatively scheduled to replace the current centralized legacy system by forth quarter, FY-01.

The envisioned system will make use of current web-based technology and provide decentralized AT/ADT/IDTT order writing authority to echelon IV and V Naval Reserve activities. The system will interface with the Defense Travel System for all commercial travel arrangements. A Business Process Review of the current system is underway and is scheduled for completion in late February 2000. Once this is completed, further system analysis will determine the final requirements for development, construction and fielding of the replacement order writing system. The new system construction is anticipated to take 18 months following completion of the Business Process Review.

COMNAVRESFOR N6 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-11-99	SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE NAVAL RESERVE ADVANCEMENT TRACKING SYSTEM (NAVRATS) AND PRT PROGRAM	OPEN
----------	--	------

This item involves Business Program changes and COMNAVRESFOR N1 owns both the NAVRATS and PRT programs where the Naval Reserve Force is concerned. Therefore, COMNAVRESFOR N1 should address this item with the functional process owners at COMNAVPERSCOM.

COMNAVRESFOR N1 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-12-99	COMMON WEB PAGE HOSTING	OPEN

COMNAVRESFOR N62 has established a common web site host environment with the Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station (NCTS) Pensacola to consolidate all Naval Reserve web sites. Guidance to the field will be forthcoming to explain the procedures for establishing their web sites at NCTS Pensacola.

COMNAVRESFOR N6 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-13-99	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AUGMENT UNITS	OPEN
----------	--------------------------------------	------

The initiative to establish an IT unit to support Naval Reserve IT requirements is still underway. A Facts and Justification has been staffed by COMNAVRESFOR and has been forwarded up the chain to establish a Naval Reserve IT unit. This unit will be staffed with CPOs-CAPTs who have extensive IT expertise. The timeline has not yet been established.

COMNAVRESFOR N6 will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-14-99	ACTIVE DUTY TRAINING (ADT) FUNDING FOR MEDICAL UNITS/PERSONNEL	OPEN
----------	---	------

CME is a training issue. COMNAVRESFOR N01M has recommended, via the POM process, that an additional \$17M per year is needed to fund medical readiness/sustainment training. This was raised during POM-00 and COMNAVRESFOR successfully increased this budget by \$5M across the FYDP. The Health Service Flag Council has recommended for FY-00 that the majority of the funds be used for AMSUS. CNO (OP-931) is the resource sponsor for this budget line.

COMNAVRESFOR N01M will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

II-15-99	RESERVISTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO JOIN THE MEDICAL PLAN ESTABLISHED FOR MILITARY DEPENDENTS	OPEN
----------	---	------

This issue was address during the Health Care Summit. A resolution in about 18 months is not beyond the realm of possibility.

COMNAVRESFOR N01M is monitoring an OSD study and as information becomes available will provide such to COMNAVRESFOR N1 and N00J for action.

COMNAVRESFOR N01M will brief further progress at the 2000 Policy Board.

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
II-16-99	GOVERNMENT RATE AIR TRAVEL	CLOSED

This has been signed into law and the DOD policy message is forthcoming. The time line is "any day now." This will make Government rate air travel available to all SELRES during the IDT weekend.

Once DOD guidance is released on the use of the GSA Airlines City Pairs Contract, COMNAVRESFOR will issue a policy guidance message immediately.

II-17-99	FACILITY MANAGER BILLET AT NAVAL RESERVE ACTIVITIES	CLOSED
----------	--	--------

This issue is being reviewed as part of IP-2000. Several of the Naval Reserve Fleet Support Centers (NRFSCs) will most likely receive an additional E5/E6 to perform facilities management on a full-time basis. This will be accomplished on a case-by-case basis. The primary justification for this body will be at those NRFSCs where the facility is older and needs more emphasis, and the Reserve Force owns them. Having a full-time facilities petty officer at each NRFSC would be nice to have, but cannot be justified.